

VOLUME 19

NUMBER 5

PRICE 8p

JUN 12 1978



Christian Order

Summary of Contents for May, 1978

MIDDLE OF THE MASS	<i>Father Bryan Houghton</i>
S AND THE BISHOPS	<i>The Editor</i>
NNER IN THE WORKS	<i>Michael Davies</i>
STERIAL PRIESTHOOD IN CATHOLIC CHURCH	<i>Father J. v. d. Ploeg, O.P.</i>
KGROUND TO THE HORN	<i>Czeslaw Jesman</i>
S AND THE MEN	<i>Paul Crane, S.J.</i>
A SPARROW FALLS	<i>Frank Rickards</i>

CHRISTIAN ORDER CASSETTES

FATHER PAUL CRANE, S.J.

Sole Supplier : C.V. Productions, 48, Cambridge Road, Wigmore, Gillingham, Kent, U.K. Phone Medway (0634 - 33168).

"Crisis in the Church"

Fr. Crane is here alerting those concerned enough to listen to the devastating effect on the Church of the extremists that have surfaced since Vatican II. He says that "Christ never sought to be accepted by men on their terms. He would only be accepted by men insofar as they accepted his terms". And again, "Christ founded a Church which is for everybody. . . It was not to be a Church whose significance could be grasped only by aesthetes . . . The first members were simple fishermen".

Cassette No. L080876 £2, post 15p; \$4, post \$1 (US)

"Ourselves and the Church"

What does God require of us today? Not natural or self-fulfilment, but supernatural fulfilment; to fulfil His will in our regard. Dismas, St. Benedict Joseph Labre, St. James the Less, St. Bernadette and Matt Talbot are cited as examples; hardly the cream of society from the world's standpoint, but people who have lived out the will of God. A present-day example is the young Lithuanian woman, Nijole Sadunite, who chose 3 years hard labour in a Siberian concentration camp rather than cease witnessing to her Faith. This is what Christianity is all about.

In this lecture Father Crane brings a tremendously hopeful atmosphere to his listeners.

Cassette No. L150577 £2, post 15p; \$4, post \$1 (US)

"Pro Fide : Seven Years After : What Next ?"

This talk is sub-titled "The Way Ahead" and it is the answer to those who feel an anguished need to assist in preventing the Catholic Church from being dismantled from within. Father Crane points out, in a lucid and very dynamic manner, the sensitive areas and how the most effective action in them can be carried out. At the same time, he is trying to tell listeners of the pitfalls that exist on either side of "the way ahead". He stresses the need for doctrinal unity under the Pope and for the need to break the habit of social conformism that has damaged the Church in the past in no small way.

Cassette No. L14277 £2, post 15p; \$4, post \$1 (US)

"Communism and the Catholic Church"

Father Crane's opposition to Communism, which has been life-long, does not imply any support for the depredations of monopoly capitalism or the increasingly permissive and secularist society of the materialistic West. His purpose in this cassette is to trace the faulty thinking, which has been let loose within the Church since Vatican II and which has transformed so tragically the one-time sturdy and feared opponent of Communism into its faltering ally. 2 Cassettes : £4.20 or \$9.50 (post-free).

Contents

ge

- 8 OUR OWN TRUMPET
The Editor
- 2 HUGH ROSS WILLIAMSON:
A TRIBUTE Michael Davies
- 5 THE MUDDLE OF THE
MASS Fr. Bryan Houghton
- 0 LETTERS TO LUCIFER: 3 R. S.
- 2 ARMS AND THE
BISHOPS The Editor
- 7 SPANNER IN THE
WORKS Michael Davies
- 4 MINISTERIAL PRIESTHOOD
IN THE CATHOLIC
CHURCH, Fr. J. v. d. Ploeg, O.P.
- 6 NOT A SPARROW
FALLS Frank Rickards
- 6 BACKGROUND TO THE
HORN Czeslaw Jesman
- FIVE WOUNDS OF HOLY
CHURCH: 4 Dr. Rudolf Graber
- ANY QUESTIONS?
William Lawson, S.J.
- BOOK REVIEW Paul Crane, S.J.

You Change Your Address:

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows:

U.S.A., Canada
India, etc.— £4.00, U.S. \$8.00
Australia — £4.50, A. \$8.00
N. Zealand—£4.50, N.Z. \$8.00

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 19

MAY, 1978

NUMBER

Our Own Trumpet

THE EDITOR

READERS will be glad to learn that, during past month the beginnings of an increasingly effective co-operative effort within the ranks of those devoted to the defence of the Faith in this country have become plainly discernible. The need for a long time has been to get the message to as many as possible at home and abroad. It can now be said that, as a result of much hard work laced with information and strong co-operation, we are in process of doing that.

Where good reading material is concerned, the Pro Fide Book Service, so ably stocked and managed by the indefatigable Ted Wade, has been the greatest help to many for a long time. It continues to go from strength to strength. Inquirers should write, not to me, but to E. Wade, Esq., MBE, Pro Fide Book Service, 39, Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon, Surrey. Then there are two further addresses which readers ought to know and from contact with which they will benefit. The first is that of Father Guy Brinkworth, S.J., editor and publisher of the excellent "Personal Spiritual Renewal Series". His booklets and pamphlets are of the utmost value to hard-pressed Catholics at the present time. In particular, we recommend unreservedly *The First "R"*, part 1 of a series dealing with religious instruction and simply invaluable. Send your inquiries to Rev. Guy Brinkworth, S.J., P.S.R.S., Mater Dei Press, Convent of Mercy, Fishguard, Dyfed, Wales SA65 9DU, U.K.

And, finally, in this section, we have *Faith*, a Review edited by Father E. Holloway and its series of excellent pamphlets, which are widely appreciated. Inquiries to 2, Redford Avenue, Wallington, Surrey SM6 9DP. Another address you should know and use.

In addition to this first-class book service and these excellent pamphlets, we now have the services of an excellent and very hard-working publisher. Timothy Tindal-Robertson, who runs the Augustine Publishing Company has already given us Michael Davies' two books, *Cranmer's Godly Order* (Reprint now available) and *Pope John's Council* (First edition about sold out in under a year), four or five of the same Author's pamphlets, including three of great importance on the Mass; to say nothing of an excellent pamphlet on the priesthood by Father v. d. Ploeg, the distinguished Dutch Dominican Professor and Theologian at Nijmegen; also in another genre, a brace of delightful booklets on Lourdes and Fatima, which are a pleasure to read. There are a lot more pamphlets in the pipe, including four or five by myself in a new "Christian Order" series; a book by Michael Davies on Anglican Orders and, very importantly, the now famous book on Vatican II by Father Ralph Wiltgen, SVD entitled *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber*, which is still insufficiently known in the English-speaking world and which every reader of *Christian Order* ought, if possible, to read. It is authoritative, accurate and totally objective. The English edition should be out just about now. Your inquiries, please, to the Augustine Publishing Co., Chawleigh, Chulmleigh, Devon EX18 7HL, United Kingdom. And, when you write, ask please for a list of publications.

The reader will have gathered from the March issue of *Christian Order* that we are now in the cassette business and expecting to be there in a big way. Four cassettes by Father Paul Crane, S.J. are now available and there are three more to come in the immediate future. Already the first three are being widely distributed in the United States and to a lesser, but effective extent in the United Kingdom. In addition, and most importantly, we have available now a series of six cassettes on the Penny Catechism. These are the work of Father Hugh Thwaites, S.J. and they have

been highly praised already. It seems to me that they fill most admirably a yawning gap that has grown in the post-conciliar years. Parents and teachers, especially, will welcome them; the instruction in the fundamentals of the Faith which they provide is not only for the young, but for the old. The set of six cassettes (both sides of each) costs £15 or \$30. Like the new series of "Christian Order Cassettes" made by Father Crane they are available from John Edwards, C.V. Productions, 48, Cambridge Road, Gillingham, Kent BEB 0JE, United Kingdom, to whom all inquiries should be sent. He is ready to deal with all orders not only from this country, but from the English-speaking world, which we are in business to serve. And, alongside these catechetical cassettes, so to say, you should have in hand Canon F. H. Drinkwater's most excellent and orthodox *Abbreviated Catechism with Explanations*. This is available at 60p (postage extra) in its new, up-to-date and fifth edition from the Pro Fide Book Service and the Publishers, Catechetical Book Centre, 7 Bingham Road, Addiscombe, Croydon, Surrey, United Kingdom. The first edition of this reprint sold out at 6000 copies with no notice and no advertisement that I know of from the official Catholic Press in this country. We expect a final sales total of not less than 60,000 copies. Help us, please, to get this splendid Catechism really going throughout the English-speaking world. It is for you and your children; and a lot of voluntary effort and voluntary money has gone into its reissue. Let this splendid effort not be in vain. Give it your backing. We are at your service wherever you may be in the English-speaking world. Let us get going now. Under God and with your support nothing, absolutely nothing can stop us.

Finally, *Christian Order*. We sold out at 11,000 in December, 11,300 in January, 11,500 in February and 11,600 in March. You can draw your own conclusions. We thank God. I am afraid we don't thank National Carriers. Their delay hangs a tale. No-one is more annoyed than I at the irregularity and delays that have marked the distribution of *Christian Order* since—in an effort to escape the all-too-costly Irish postage — we arranged for the Review to be posted from England, whilst continuing to be printed in the Irish Republic. This necessitated the transport of each issue

Christian Order from Ireland to this country. In this operation the Irish Printers and Carriers have played their part splendidly. So, too, have the English distributors. It is the nationalized Carriers of this country who have let us down, I am afraid, in the most shocking fashion. Take, for example, the March issue. This was delivered by our Irish printers to our Irish Carriers promptly on February 15th. It arrived at Fleetwood in Lancashire on February 18th for transport to our distributors at Preston, which is only a few miles away. What happened? I can only tell you this. By March 2nd—twelve days later—the whereabouts of the March issue of *Christian Order* was still unknown. What *can* you do? Apologies, in the first place, to readers; which I give here and now. At the same time, I continue to make every effort to find an alternative service; and I believe, at this moment of writing, that I have found one. Meanwhile, let me thank you for your patience and understanding.

Against the background of what has been written in this editorial I think I can say that we are now on the way. There are two more things I must do before closing this editorial.

The first is to thank all those readers who have given such tremendous support in so many ways to *Christian Order* over the past years. Without it we would have been finished long ago. None knows this better than I. Under God you are my strength. I am immensely grateful to you all. Secondly, may I commend to you as high-powered incisive and extremely important in these difficult days the review, *Approaches*, published by my friend Hamish Fraser from 1, Waverley Place, Saltcoats, Ayrshire KA21 1AX, Scotland. Our debt to Fraser is immense. He was sounding the alarm with regard to affairs within the Church long before most of us had even begun to realise that anything was really wrong. Events have shown how right he was and how courageous the stand he took. He is still at the front of the fray, daring where few would dare, outspoken in his defence of Catholic Truth, humble in his acceptance of it. Had we a hundred like him, we would have won long ago. The very least we can do is read him *Approaches*. The gain will be wholly ours.

Hugh Ross Williamson

A Tribute

MICHAEL DAVIES

ON 13th January-1978, the feast of the Baptism of Our Lord a great and much loved Catholic, Hugh Ross Williamson, died at his home in London aged 77, two hours after receiving the Last Rites of Holy Mother Church. Many of those who admired his writing will be unaware of the fact that he had been in constant pain for the last six years of his life, and confined to his bed, with increasing pain, for the final hour. Nonetheless, his tenacity and courage were such that during this period he was able to produce *Catherine de Medici*, *Lorenzo the Magnificent*, *Letter to Julia* (an inspired evocation of the basis of our Faith) and, lastly, *The Princess a Nun!* — to be published posthumously. The perfect Christian resignation and steadfastness in illness shown by Hugh Ross Williamson led the late Cardinal Heenan to preach a Lenten sermon on him in 1974 citing him as an heroic example of Christian resignation. (See *The Remnant*, vol. 8, no. 22, p. 7.)

Hugh Ross Williamson had been a journalist, an historian, a dramatist, a broadcaster, a politician, a theologian, an Anglo-Catholic priest, and finally a Roman Catholic layman. He was that very rare species, a true polymath. His death has deprived us of a truly great man, one who was courteous, witty, and brilliant. His personality was a mixture of warmth, erudition, and fun. He has, thankfully, left behind a wealth of books, plays, articles and memorabilia which will long survive him.

His entire life was dominated by a concern for truth which led him to make challenging contributions in political, historical, and theological fields. He wrote over 30 books and some 20 plays. His journalism and politics went long more to the earlier part of his life when, as drama critic and leader writer on the *Yorkshire Post*, and later as Editor of *The Bookman*, he encouraged many young journalists.

and writers. When in politics, as a Labour candidate, he was expelled from that Party in 1938 because he criticised the power of Transport House (the Labour Party headquarters).

His historical works are mainly concerned with Plantagenet, Tudor, and Stuart history, leading up to and following the Reformation, until the final defeat of the Stuarts and of the Catholic Church in England by William of Orange and his powerful supporters. Notable amongst these books are biographies of Mary Tudor and Elizabeth I (*The Sisters*), Charles I and Cromwell, James II (*James by the Grace of God*) and an unravelling of the Gunpowder Plot, showing it to be the work of agents provocateurs. Allied to these are a series of books he wrote on the passing of the Plantagenets, including two on Cardinal Pole (the last Catholic Cardinal of England for several centuries) and another series on the end of the Valois of France. They all link up to reveal a vast panorama of concerted plots, revolutions, and civil wars leading to the overthrow of the existing order and civilization of Christendom in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Hugh Ross Williamson was born in the shadow of Romsey Abbey and, as the son of a Congregationalist minister, he had discussed and read theology from boyhood. His theological books concentrated principally upon the Holy Mass through which he hoped that the Church of England would return to the fulness of the Catholic faith. It was with this object in mind that he wrote *The Great Prayer*, a study of the Canon of the Mass, whilst still an Anglican. Ordained at the age of 43, he was appointed curate at St. Cyprian's Marylebone, and later assistant priest of St. Thomas, Regent Street. He entered the Catholic Church as a result of the establishment of the Church of South India. This body was formed by amalgamating Anglicans and various Nonconformist denominations and accepting the orders of all the denominations involved as of equal validity. This made nonsense of Anglican claims to the Apostolic Succession. Once he had become convinced of the invalidity of Anglican Orders he applied for membership of the Catholic Church and was received in 1955. The same logic which had led him out of the Church of England

made him one of the first Catholics to realise the dangers of the liturgical reform which followed Vatican II. He was a founder member of the Latin Mass Society and, as one of its most erudite members, was quick to appreciate that doctrinal rather than cultural considerations should motivate opposition to the changes. In an address given to the Latin Mass Society in 1968 he warned that the coming Normative Mass was the affirmation in the liturgical sphere of the errors of the new theology and that he was not personally inclined to fight for the Mass in Latin if this meant for the Normative Mass. The Society took a referendum on its future policy and the overwhelming majority of members took the same view so that, today, it is committed to the defence of the Tridentine Mass. During his final years when he was confined to his bed, traditionalist priests would come to celebrate the Tridentine Mass for him from time to time, and this proved a great consolation. He was buried on 20th January with a full Tridentine Requiem Mass.

Hugh Ross Williamson expressed his views on the liturgical reform in *The Modern Mass* and *The Great Betrayal*. Among his other religious books are *The Beginnings of the English Reformation*, *Were You There?* (meditations for Holy Week), *The Flowering Hawthorn*, and *The Arrow and the Sword*. Plays with religious themes are *The Mime of Bernadette*, performed for the saint's centenary at the Albert Hall; a dramatization of *The Pilgrim's Progress* at the Royal Opera House, Covent Garden, for the 250th anniversary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; *St. Teresa of Avila* with Dame Sybil Thorndike; and *His Eminence of England*, the Canterbury Festival play on Cardinal Pole for 1953. There are also radio plays: for example, *Story without End*, and *Paul, a Bondsman*.

It is difficult to convey the width and depth of his knowledge and achievements but his was a life to celebrate indeed, a life which was honourably and bravely fulfilled. A friend and admirer wrote: "Hugh was and always will be to me, one of the most outstanding men I have ever met. I do not think I have ever before known anyone who was intellectually brilliant, utterly truthful, and completely kind and gentle".

In *Christian Order* for August 1977 there appeared an imaginary *Ad clerum* under the title "To Toe or Draw the Line". Here is a second one from the same bishop, who has acquired a name and a see: Edmund Forester, Bishop of Stamford. Both are extracts from a novel called "Mitre and Crook" which will be published early in 1979 by Arlington House Publishers, 165 Huguenot Street, New Rochelle, New York.

The Muddle of the Mass

FATHER BRYAN HOUGHTON

Right Reverend, Very Reverend and Reverend Fathers,

On Wednesday you received an anonymous and undated circular which purported to prove that I had no right to permit the Immemorial Mass in this diocese. This, as you are well aware, is nonsense, as can be seen from the general law of the Church, Article 22 of the *Constitution* of November 1963, Article 6 of the *General Instructions* to the new *Ordo* of 1969 etc . . . and by common sense, all of which commit the liturgy to the pastoral care of the chief pastor, the bishop, so long as he is acting within the law of the Church.

The circular, however, gives me the opportunity of going to the question of the liceity of the Immemorial Mass in some detail. It has all been said before by Professors Louis Vergeron and Neri Capponi and by Fr. Bryan Houghton among others, but it is more than likely that your attention has not been drawn to their publications and, if it has, you have not had time to read them. As you will see, I am attempting to do more than answer the circular. I am trying to guide you through the labyrinth of documents in which the Mass has been lost, so that you will know how you should act in the event of my death.

The Situation before Vatican II

It should be remembered that before 1570 no Pope and no Council had ever legislated over the rite in which Mass

was celebrated. The astonishing similarity between the rite in the Western Church arose from the fact that no bishop or priest dared innovate in anything so sacred. If in doubt they discovered what was the common practice in Rome. The attitude was notably different from that of some contemporary priests who seem to imagine that the Eucharist would be invalid if they failed to tinker with it. Actually the only attempt to unify the rite came from civil, not ecclesiastical authority. After the conquest of Old Saxony, completed in 775 A.D., Charlemagne was faced with the problem of its evangelization. To facilitate and integrate the missionaries' work he instructed the Anglo-Saxon, Alcuin of York, to unify the rites current in the Empire.

It was the Protestant reformers who first dared to touch the rite of the Sacred Mysteries. Eucharistic forms multiplied with the same rapidity that they do today. It was to restore order in the existing chaos that the Council of Trent called upon the Pope to establish a norm for the celebration of Mass. Hence the first Papal legislation on the subject, the Bull *Quo Primum* of St. Pius V of July 19th, 1570.

What did this Bull do?

1. It consolidated and codified (*statuimus et ordinamus* are the operative words) the Immemorial Roman Rite.
2. It made its use compulsory throughout the Latin Church, except
3. when other rites had a continuous usage of over two hundred years, such as those of Sarum, Lyons, Toledo, Milan, the Dominicans, Carthusians etc.
4. It granted a perpetual Indult to all priests under all circumstances to celebrate according to the Immemorial Roman Rite thus codified.

It is to be observed therefore, that the so called "Tridentine Rite" does not exist by the positive law of one Pope which the next is at liberty to undo. It exists by immemorial custom to which the laity who attend it have as much right as the clergy who celebrate it. Is it not possible that this point has been overlooked? Anyway, an immemorial rite can be extinguished by two means:

- a) by a solemn pronouncement of the Sovereign Pontiff abrogating the customary right on the grounds that its continuance would be contrary to the common good;

by the customary right falling into desuetude — along with the custom the right lapses.

On the other hand, what is of positive law in the Bull *Quo Primum* is the exclusivity granted to the Immemorial Roman Rite, apart from rites over two hundred years old. This exclusivity can clearly be modified by a succeeding Pope without any appeal to “reasonableness” and “the common good”.

The Second Vatican Council

Such was the position on which we were all agreed, Pope, bishops, priests, laity, up to and including the Council.

In November 1963 the Council promulgated its Constitution on the liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. It should be noted that this document is a *Constitution*, the most solemn form of legislation of which a Council is capable. What does it do? Does it abrogate (=abolish), obrogate (=substitute) or derogate (=make exceptions to) previous legislation and notably the Bull *Quo Primum*? Not a bit of it; it takes it all for granted. It merely speaks of “*in-augmentatio*”. The Latin *instaurare* does not mean to restore in the sense of restoring a ruined building. It means to restore in the way we restore our tissues in a restaurant. In fact it means to refresh. Even the refreshment was to be pretty abstemious as we learn from Article 36: “the use of the Latin language shall be maintained (*servetur*) in the Latin rites”. Article 54 allows for the local dialects “above all for the lessons and community prayers . . . also in the responses of the people”. In fact, a dialogue Mass was permitted, although not made compulsory. Please re-read *Sacrosanctum Concilium* without hindsight: what it says, not what it has been made to say.

So far we have two laws, both duly promulgated in the most solemn form of which the Church is capable:

A Papal Constitution, the Bull *Quo Primum* of 1570;

A Conciliar Constitution, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* of 1963.

The second confirms the first, merely permitting certain specific derogations in the matter of language by its Article 54.

III. The Sequence

i. Two months later, on January 25th, 1964, Pope Paul VI issued a *motu proprio* called *Sacram Liturgiam*. A *motu proprio* is a binding Papal document, be it legislative, judicial or administrative. What passes belief is that this is the only one on the liturgy which the Pope has issued to date that is in thirteen years. This unique document fixes the parts of the Mass to be said in the native dialect as recommended by Article 54 of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: the introductory psalm, epistle and gospel etc. . . . Unfortunately it also announced the creation of a special Consilium (with an 's' in the middle, consequently an advisory body) to put into effect the Council's recommendations. This was duly established on February 29th under the chairmanship of Cardinal Lercaro.

ii. It took a little time for the Consilium to warm to its work and its first publication, the Institution, *Inter Oecumenici* of September 26th 1964, could, with a bit of pushing and pulling, be fitted into the Council's *Constitution*. It permitted (but did not enjoin) the whole of the Mass apart from the Preface and Canon, to be said in the vernacular. It reintroduced the bidding-prayers, which the Council had never demanded. It also delegated liturgical powers to bishops.

It was from this moment onwards that serious opposition began to be felt. For instance, I think the Latin Mass Society was founded early in 1965. Several perfectly reasonable priests rang the alarm. Myself, being neither a theologian nor a Canon Lawyer but a clerical accountant, though *Inter Oecumenici* unwise but not impossible. I became your bishop. ♦

iii. Owing perhaps to the opposition, the Consilium remained reasonably inactive for nearly three years. Then on May 4th, 1967 it produced its *Tres abhinc annos* better known as the *Instructio Altera*. This, my dear Fathers, was the revolution. Permission was granted for the whole Mass including the Canon and Consecration, to be said aloud and in the vernacular. This is clean contrary to paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 36 of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. It was, of course, a derogation from the law, a pure permission, but

we were all made to realize that laws were no longer meant to be obeyed whereas permissions were obligatory.

What is the legal value of such an *Instruction*? It is not easy to determine. The Consilium, as its name implies, was a counselling body. It should therefore have produced either the Pope to issue a *motu proprio* or the ministry concerned, the Congregation of Rites, to send out a *Notification*. It did neither, but issued its own *Instruction*. Whatever its value, one thing is quite certain: it cannot derogate from any existing law, in the particular case, from the Pope's *motu proprio* of January 25th, 1964 and from the Council's *Constitution*. It was a try-on.

The trouble is that it worked. Neither the Pope nor the episcopate questioned the *Instructio Altera*. From that moment onwards the progressive bureaucracy knew that it was master. The bishops, from Rome to Stamford, had dedicated.

The extent of the abdication became almost immediately evident. In October of the same year, 1967, the Consilium produced its *Missa Normativa* at the Synod of Bishops. It was rejected by 104 votes to 72. What did that matter? It has become law as the *New Ordo*.

7. *The New Ordo: A. The Constitution Missale Romanum*

This has the most puzzling history of all. May I remind you, Fathers, that we already have two documents of the highest conceivable authority: the Bull *Quo Primum* of St. Paul VI and the Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* of Vatican II which are, moreover, in line with each other. What happens next?

On April 3rd, 1969, a Papal *Constitution* entitled *Missale Romanum* was promulgated, purporting to be the law governing the New Order of Mass, as yet unpublished. In its original version it is not a law at all but an explanatory introduction to a permission. Even the word *Constitutio* is nowhere to be found in the text, merely in the title. There is no abrogation of previous legislation and no clause ordering the use of the new rite. There is no sentence to show that it is obligatory let alone exclusive. There is no dating clause to show when it should come into effect.

This, of course, did not prevent the powers that be from saying that it was a binding law. To do so they had recourse to a mis-translation. What is so curious is that this mis-translation was common to all languages. I have read it myself in English, French and Italian; I am told that it is the same in German and Spanish. How can this possibly come about? How can all these expert translators make the identical howler? Your guess is as good as mine.

Here is the sentence, the fourth before the end in the original version, the fifth in the *Acta*:

“Ad extremum, ex iis quae hactenus de novo Missal Romano exposuimus quiddam nunc *cogere et efficere* placet”. I have underlined the mis-translated word. “Cogere et efficere” is a well known Ciceronian phrase to be found in most dictionaries. Even if the translators could not be bothered to look it up, it is perfectly clear that *quiddam cogere* breaks down into *agere quiddam con*=to work something together, which is in, the context, “to sum up”. Equally *quiddam efficere* breaks down into *facere quiddam ex*=to make something out, which is, in the context, “to draw a conclusion”. The sentence therefore means: “Lastly from what we have so far declared concerning the new Roman Missal, We should now like to sum up and draw a conclusion”. And what did all the translators make of it? In English, “In conclusion, We now wish to give the force of law to all We have declared . . .;” and in French “Pour terminer, Nous voulons donner force de loi à tout ce que Nous avons exposé . . .;” and in Italian etc. . . It is strange, my dear Fathers, but such is the truth: “to sum up and draw a conclusion” becomes “to give the force of law”.

And what did I do about it? Absolutely nothing; for the simple reason that I did not bother to read the Latin until two or three years later. Do not judge me too severely. Have you read it?

But that is not the end. Worse is to come. The *Acta* of June 1969 were published as usual about two months later. When it appeared a brand new clause had been inserted into the original document as the penultimate paragraph. It reads: “Quae Constitutione hac Nostra praescriptissima vigere incipient a XXX proximi mensis Novembris huius anno, id est a Dominica I Adventus”. That is: “What V

ve ordered by this Our Constitution will begin to take effect as from November 30th of this year (1969), that is the 1st Sunday of Advent". You will notice that for the first and only time the word "*Constitutio*" appears in the text. For the first time, too, a word signifying "to order" is introduced—*praescripsimus*. For the first time a date is given at which the order is to become effective. Thus is a permission turned into law.

Actually, there are a couple of snags even about this insertion. The word "*praescripsimus*"—We have ordered—is not the proper term in Latin, but I shall not bother you with such refinements. More important, it is in the wrong tense. Up to this point the legislator has prescribed nothing at all. It is precisely in this clause that he claims to do so. The verb, therefore, should be in the present tense, *praescribitur*—"what We are ordering by this our *Constitution*"; not the perfect, "what We have prescribed". The only explanation I can think of for this howler is recognition by its author that he is tampering with a pre-existing text. Moreover, the logical conclusion from the use of the wrong tense can scarcely be what its author intended: since nothing *was* prescribed, nothing *is* prescribed; and the legislator, to boot, is still prescribing nothing. What a mess! I wonder how long a civil government would last which thus tampered with its own laws?

There is a last remark I wish to make about this strange document. It winds up with the usual *clause de style*: "We wish, moreover, that these decisions and ordinances of Ours should be stable and effective now and in future, notwithstanding—in so far as may be necessary—*Constitutions* and *apostolic Regulations* published by Our Predecessors and all other ordinances, even those requiring special mention and derogation". At long last—indeed it is the last word—there is a technical term in the *Constitution*, so we know exactly where we stand: "derogation". The *New Ordo* is therefore only a permission after all. It is merely a licit exception, a derogation, to the previous laws which are still in force. They have not been abrogated. But surely it is only a mistake? The author of the *praescripsimus* clause forgot to alter the *clause de style*? Maybe, but it proves three things: 1. one's sins always find one out; 2. the author

has a highly efficient Guardian Angel; 3. it is nonsense to claim that the Bull *Quo Primum* has been abrogated.

Mistranslation, insertion, error: it is all highly distasteful. Needless to say there has been no apology, explanation or withdrawal. It is those who point out these irregularities who are accused of being disloyal!

Do these irregularities invalidate the *Constitution*? Of course not; it is a valid law in the terms published in the *Acta*. At most, it could be maintained that the wrong tense of *praescriptus* makes its meaning doubtful and "*lex dubia non obligat*"—but it does not much matter as it is only a permission anyway. No, the irregularities do not invalidate the law. All they do is to make me highly suspicious of the present administration.

To sum up:

1. The Constitution *Missale Romanum* of April 3rd, 1969 has been duly promulgated. That is why I permit the use of the *New Ordo* in this diocese.
2. It has derogated from the exclusive use of the Immemorial Mass but has not abrogated the Bull *Quo Primum*. That is why I permit the use of the Tridentine Rite.
3. It has not abrogated the Conciliar *Constitution, Sacrosanctum Concilium*. That is why I permit: a) the "hybrid" Mass; b) the reintroduction of the offertory etc. . . . into the *New Ordo*—since these are in line with the said Constitution.

B: The Institution Generalis and New Preces

i. One of the reasons why the all-important *Constitution* received such scant attention was that on April 6th (consequently two months before its publication in the *Acta*) the New Mass forms were released, preceded by a theological rubrical introduction called the *Institutio Generalis*. I am ashamed to say that it was received with unctious enthusiasm by us bishops, although the Mass rites were practically identical with what the Synod of Bishops had rejected in October, 1967. You priests were marginally better: you received it with glum gloom but little protest. Opposition was left to the laity. It became highly vociferous and found expression in the *Critical Study* presented by Cardinal Ottaviani and Bacci to the Pope on September 25th of the

same year. If you have kept a copy of the *Critical Study*, please re-read it. You will notice that it does not merely criticise the theology of the *Introduction*, but the Mass rites which give expression to that theology.

ii. This opposition did in fact have some effect. On October 20th, 1969, less than a month after the *Critical Study* had been presented to the Pope, the Consilium issued an *Instruction, Constitutione Apostolica*, delaying the introduction of the *New Ordo* from November 30th, 1969 to November 28th, 1971; nominally, to give time to prepare vernacular translations. In the meantime, the *New Ordo* could be said in Latin. On the other hand, in this document also, we hear for the first time that the Immemorial Mass may only be said by aged priests *sine populo*, without a congregation. This is pure usurpation of power and has no basis in law.

iii. On the following March 26th, 1970, a new edition of the *Institutio Generalis* was issued. The heretical clause 7—"The Mass is the sacred synaxis or congregation of the People of God"—was made merely ambiguous and clauses 8, 55, 56 and 60 were amended. So much for the permanent value of the most solemn Roman documents under the present administration. Not only is there tampering with the basic law governing the *New Ordo*, but its theological justification has to be amended within a year of publication. This certainly calls for blind obedience since it is difficult to obey with open eyes. What remains quite inexplicable, however, is that the Mass forms themselves have not been changed. Their theological justification has gone; they are unaltered.

Incidentally, it is in that same year, the year of opposition, that the English Martyrs were canonized and Cardinal Heenan of blessed memory secured his Indult.

4. *The New Ordo in Operation*

As I have said, the opposition was almost exclusively lay. The powers that be could not deal with it as summarily as they could with the clergy. There was over a year of patient waiting to see if the laity could organize themselves. It became clear that with an inadequate supply of priests and no bishop to stand for them they could not. Hence we

got the second revolutionary document. You will remember that the first was the *Instructio Altera* of May 4th, 1967, which decided, contrary to the law, that the whole of the Mass, including the consecration, should be said aloud and in the vernacular. Well, this time it is a bit worse. On June 14th, 1971, the Congregation for Divine Worship issued a *Notification* granting to Episcopal Conferences the right to impose the exclusive use of the vernacular in the *New Ordo*, once the translations had been approved. It thus became illicit to celebrate the *New Ordo* in Latin. So much for the Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.

Be it noted that a *Notification* is a purely administrative document and has no legislative authority whatsoever. Moreover, this particular one was itself undated and unsigned. It is therefore worth less than the paper on which it was printed. The bishops, from Rome to Stamford, remained mute.

ii. Of course the inevitable result of this particular piece of administrative folly was to throw all Latinists into the arms of the Tridentiners. There was no alternative if the *New Ordo* was illicit in Latin. It became imperative to divide the opposition, especially as Archbishop Lefebvre had cropped up in the meantime. The laity had thus found a bishop with the promise of future priests. Hence the *Notification* of October 28th, 1974. This document reverses the previous ruling: the *New Ordo* may now be said in Latin or vernacular with equality of esteem. The *New Ordo*, however, is obligatory "notwithstanding the pretext of any custom whatsoever even immemorial". The importance of this last remark is that for the first time the Establishment admitted the existence of immemorial rights, even if only to brush them aside.

iii. From this moment onwards the assault against the old rite slightly changed tack. At the beginning of this *Ad clerum* I wrote: "An immemorial right can be extinguished by two means:

- a) by a solemn pronouncement of the Sovereign Pontiff, abrogating the customary right on the grounds that its continuance would be contrary to the common good;
- b) by the customary right falling into desuetude—along with the custom the right lapses".

It would not be easy to prove that the Immemorial Mass had been contrary to the common good. Who would believe it? Moreover, by 1974 it was a bit late to start saying so, especially as the Second Vatican Council had said nothing of the sort. The alternative was to crush the custom as rapidly as possible, preferably under the existing administration.

This explains the extraordinary animosity against Archbishop Lefebvre: he is busy perpetuating the immemorial custom. It also explains the astonishing pressure brought to bear on the English Hierarchy to petition for the withdrawal of Cardinal Heenan's Indult. In its humble way, the Indult too is preserving the custom. I may add that, if it still exists, it is thanks to Cardinal Heenan's successor.

vi. Great tragedies are heightened by farcical interludes. Four days after the *Notification* of October 28th, 1974, on November 1st, 1974, the Congregation promulgated its two little Eucharists for Reconciliations and three for kiddies.

VI Papal Intervention

You may well ask, in this plethora of *Constitutions, Institutions, Instructions* and *Notifications*, has the Pope done or said nothing? The two questions are rather different. What he has done is restricted to: a) the *motu proprio, Sacram Liturgiam*, of January, 25th, 1964, which was rendered nugatory by the Consilium's *Instructio Altera* of May 4th, 1967; b) the Constitution *Missale Romanum* of April 3rd, 1969, presumably along with the clause inserted into the *Acta*. What he has said is a very different matter. In 1969, there are the Allocutions of April 28th, of November 19th and again of November 26th. As the years roll by, so do the Allocutions. However, they are all summed up in the Consistorial Allocution of May 24th, 1976 to which the anonymous Canon Lawyer refers. It is a little more harsh than the rest because it was directed primarily against Archbishop Lefebvre. I translate the relevant passage.

"It is in the name of tradition itself that We require all our sons and all Catholic communities to celebrate the liturgy according to the renewed rite with dignity and fervour. The use of the *New Ordo* is by no means left to the discretion of priests and faithful. The *Instruction* of June

14th, 1971 has provided that the celebration of Mass according to the Old Rite should only be allowed, with the permission of the Ordinary, to aged and sick priests when celebrating with nobody present. The *New Ordo* has been promulgated to replace the Old after mature deliberation and in order to fulfil the Council's decisions. It is in exactly the same way that Our predecessor Saint Pius V made obligatory the Missal recognised by his authority after the Council of Trent. By the same supreme authority, which We have received from Christ, We decree the same prompt obedience to all the other reforms, be they liturgical, disciplinary or pastoral, which in recent years have grown up out of the decrees of the Council".

And what is one to say to that?

Well, in the first place, the translators have been at it again. In the passage concerning Pius V the Latin has: ". . . St. Pius V made obligatory the Missal recognized (*recognitum*) by his authority"—which is perfectly correct; whereas the Italian has ". . . reformed (*riformato*) by his authority"—which is perfectly incorrect but suits the argument better. The whole point is that Pius V reformed nothing at all: he codified the Immemorial Rite; whereas a little later in the same passage Paul VI admits that "the *New Ordo* has been promulgated to replace the Old". So the *New Ordo* is not even a reform but a "replacement" or substitution—for which the technical term is "obrogation". But not even a Pope can obrogate an immemorial custom — unless there are two or more immemorial customs running concurrently and one is substituted for the other. A new usage cannot obrogate an immemorial custom unless the latter is first abrogated, abolished; only then can the new usage fill the void. Therein, I think, lies the real importance of the text: the admission that the *New Ordo* is not a reform of the Mass, but a substitute for the Mass. Anyway, the statement is incorrect: Pius V did not make the Old Ordo exclusive since he allowed all rites over two hundred years old to continue; neither has Paul VI made the New exclusive since only eighteen months previously he had permitted the rites for Reconciliations and kiddies.

I suppose I should mention briefly a few other points. A Consistorial Allocution is a speech. It is not a law. In

the present case it illustrates Paul VI's deep affection for the *New Ordo*. This is perfectly natural: most parents believe that they beget nothing but swans. More significant is that His Holiness should make no appeal to the only laws on the subject which have been duly promulgated: his own *Constitution* of 1969 and the Council's of 1963. Concerning the latter he uses an euphemism: "the reforms . . . which in recent years have grown up out of the decrees of the Council". But one has every right to question a "growth" which, in his own words, is a "substitution". His Holiness is therefore left to appeal to what he calls the *Instruction* of June 14th, 1971. This is most unfortunate. As we have seen, the document issued on that date was a mere *Notification*, itself undated and unsigned. Its legal value is nil. It does, however, contain the gratuitously cruel clause that aged and infirm priests may (with permission, of course) say the Immemorial Mass provided nobody is present. This His Holiness does not blush to repeat. Lastly, the emotional appeal of the passage consists in calling upon the faithful to discard the tradition of worship in the name of the tradition of obedience. Does His Holiness not realize that the tradition of obedience is even more delicate than that of worship? He complains bitterly that he is no longer obeyed. No wonder: having undermined tradition as such, the tradition of obedience has vanished. It is all terribly sad.

VII. *The Proof of the Pudding*

At this point, Fathers, I can well imagine you saying: "the old Bishop naturally makes out a good case in his own cause. But how can I tell that his opponents could not do as much? I certainly have not time to verify the documents he mentions, let alone the ones he does not. It is beyond me. I shall just obey, even if I am called a weather-cock".

Well, I think you can judge the truth of my contention from the least expected of sources: the Lefebvre affair.

Everyone knows that the real trouble with Archbishop Lefebvre is that he sticks to the Immemorial Mass and is raining priests to do the like. Agreed? Of course.

Then, why is it that he was not suspended for that? Wasn't he? No, he was not.

A devious way was found. He is not a diocesan bishop and consequently has no "title", no right, to ordain priests. To get round this difficulty he founded the "Priestly Confraternity of St. Pius X" as a diocesan congregation in the diocese of Fribourg. Thus, as bishop-superior of his congregation he could ordain his own subjects. Rome then suppressed his congregation (legally or illegally is beside the point), so that he no longer had the right to ordain. He did ordain. He was suspended.

You see the point? It is precisely because Archbishop Lefebvre could not be suspended for saying the Immemorial Mass that a devious means had to be employed. The Establishment is determined to crush the Old Mass: it cannot do it straight so it will do it crooked.

VIII. To Sum up and Conclude: "Nunc quiddam cogere et efficere placet"

A. The summing up

i. You will have noticed that in all the documents I have quoted it is taken for granted that the Mass is the private property of priests. It is not. The priest is the executor of the Testament of God Incarnate but the faithful are just as much beneficiaries under the will as he. It is they, the faithful, who have the right to the Immemorial Mass. They can demand that the legacy be paid in a currency which has held its value from time immemorial. They are aware that we live in an age of inflation and bright new notes are soon devalued.

ii. The Immemorial Mass has not been abrogated—even if it could be. Its use is therefore licit as well as valid.

iii. The attack against it is devious: to suppress the custom thanks to the abject conformism of bishops and servile obedience of priests.

B. Conclusion

i. What I ask of you is to maintain the custom of the Immemorial Mass. You need not say it exclusively so long as you say it sometimes—always mindful, however, that the faithful have a right to it.

ii. This would not require much heroism but a little organization might help. The diocese would be unmanageable if about twenty priests were excluded from the ministry. If rather more, say thirty priests were willing to join a Secular Institute of which one of the objects were the maintainance of the Immemorial rite nothing much could be done against you.

iii. Our Administrator, Mgr. Defew, has accepted to found such an Institute. I cannot sufficiently express my gratitude to him. I enclose a form which you will kindly return to him if you are willing to join the Institute.

iv. If fewer than thirty diocesan priests have joined the Institute by March 1st, the project will be abandoned and I shall rely on the courage and integrity of individual priests to preserve the custom of the Mass of Ages.

✠ Edmund,
Bishop of Stamford.

OFF-PRINTS

of this article, "Muddle of the Mass" are available at the following rates, post free :

Single copies	10p or US 30 cents
6 copies	40p or US \$1.50
12 copies	70p or US \$2.50
50 copies	£3.00 or US \$8.00
100 copies	£5.00 or US \$15.00
500 copies	£25.00 or US \$70.00

All orders to *Christian Order*, 65, Belgrave Road, London SW1V 2BG, U.K.

Letters to Lucifer : 3

R. S.

(Impious writes from St. Canute's College of Further Education)

My Lord,

BEFORE I make My unimportant little report on progress here, may I congratulate You on Your latest, and perhaps greatest, achievement: I refer, of course, to the *Idea* of "Inter-Communion", which has spread like lightning in the Enemy's Church. Brilliant strategy indeed, worthy of the "Lord of Light"! We know, even if *they* do not, that their Bishops have not the faintest notion of allowing any such a thing, as it would destroy both themselves and the Church, but to have brought about the climate in which such an Idea could flourish is beyond praise. I understand that "Experts" and "Theologians" are already busily suggesting to the confused "Faithful" that the practice will eventually be allowed, oblivious of their Pope's absolute denial. They are fortunate, are they not, that they do not come under your Lordship's jurisdiction! The Underworld still shudders at the terrible punishment meted out to Nicholas the Lesser simply for failing to genuflect at Your Name.

As to My trivial efforts here, I must place on record that the introduction of the Vernacular was, as your Lordship anticipated, a great step forward, and has made My work not only possible, but easy. One is reminded of that poor little human who landed on the moon: the unthinkable has become a fact. (I was, by the way, on the moon myself when he arrived). I am particularly pleased with the "updated Office", especially the Compline, which was, even by our standards, beautiful, but now that we have introduced this subtle slant away from the Creator and towards the creature . . .! Pure genius. It even makes Me wince: I almost wish we had left it alone. Their "Benediction" also proved child's-play once we had got rid of the Latin;

endless distractions now with meaningless words to catchy tunes (expressely condemned by their Pope, whom they constantly invoke). So much for Aquinas: a long wait, but worth every century.

The changes in the **** are also having their effect; since every other one of these boring humans claims to understand psychology, it amazes Me that they cannot see how much easier it is to have a "humble and a contrite heart" when kneeling rather than standing, or how much against human instinct it is to stand when receiving a blessing". I always hated that genuflection at "was made Man", and was delighted when it was replaced with a bow, which (as I could have told them) has now virtually disappeared, kneeling being much more natural to them than bowing, the Creeps!

If my Lord approves, I really do think that what with the Vernacular being firmly established here, and the destruction of Religious Silence almost completed, I could now be released from this intolerably dull assignment and given something which is at least a challenge. In fact, since even our resources are stretched to the uttermost, with these endless Synods and Chapters, to say nothing of the Catholic schools, where we have to provide a devil for each teacher, and two for the Head, I feel the Seniors should be free for more important work. Archliar Nicholas has some promising juniors, and one could be sent in My place.

If your Lordship agrees, I have My eye on a certain Carthusian monastery: these infuriating monks simply will not mitigate by one iota their strict Rule of Silence, and so far we have not even succeeded in attending their Chapter: the Atmosphere is unbearable to Us. I have not much hope of success, but I could take up residence at the Lodge, and You will send Me 6 of our "Superfine" wedges, I might be able to insert the thin ends. I can do with some intellectual exercise, I can tell You, after months of Sister Polastica Aquinas!

Awaiting your Lordship's Orders,

IMPIOUS.

In this month's Current Comment, shortened involuntarily for reasons of space, Father Crane considers the Joint Pastoral of the English and Welsh Bishops in favour of disarmament. He finds himself in profound disagreement with its implied thesis.

Current Comment: Arms and the Bishops

THE EDITOR

I WAS somewhat puzzled by the Bishops' Joint Pastoral published on Peace Sunday, January 29th of this year and calling on Catholics to do all they could to promote international disarmament. I was not puzzled because I am for war and against peace. On the contrary. What I am against is the thought that unilateral disarmament—nuclear and otherwise—will promote peace. Let me explain.

International Disarmament is Unilateral

If I am reminded at this point that the Bishops in their Pastoral were not calling for unilateral but for bilateral disarmament as 'between this country and the Soviet Union and its Satellites, I am forced to point out that any call for international disarmament here in the West is reduced automatically to a call for unilateral disarmament. The reason is Soviet intransigence. For it is a known fact, which can be stated without the least fear of contradiction, that the Soviet Union has no intention whatsoever of disarming. The only kind of disarmament it is interested in is that which is undertaken unilaterally by the West. This it has been busily advocating with considerable skill and for many years through front organizations and in other ways throughout the western world. Nothing would please the Soviet Union more than to see the West lay down its arms by way of prelude to its take-over by Communist Power.

which has always had and still has as the ultimate goal of its endeavours the enslavement of the world. There is nothing new about this; nothing startling. It is common knowledge; very old hat indeed. The really astonishing thing is that the Bishops of England and Wales are apparently unaware of it; that they do appear really to believe that the Soviet Union can be prevailed upon to lay down its arms provided the West first sets it an example in this matter. The reverse, in fact, is the case. In the unlikely event of the West disarming itself unilaterally, the reaction of the Soviet Union would be not to follow suit, but to move in on the West and take it over without firing a shot. This is exactly what it wants. This is what it would be likely to get were the advocacy of the Bishops of England and Wales in favour of what would prove to be, in fact, unilateral nuclear disarmament given general effect in Western Europe and the United States. Why then, one may ask, do the Bishops advocate international disarmament?

A Front for Soviet Design

I can only assume that they do so in good faith and without any realization of what they think of as international disarmament would be reduced to in fact. Either this; which reveals on their part a frightening ignorance of ultimate Soviet intention and immediate method *or* they are under the impression that both are at the point of radical change. For this, I am afraid, there is no evidence whatsoever. On the contrary, the most recent studies reveal a build-up and readying of Soviet and Warsaw Pact forces in Europe to the point of *blitzkrieg*. This will be rendered unnecessary, of course, if the West disarms unilaterally. This explains why the Communist campaign for unilateral disarmament in the interests of peace goes ahead side by side with the build-up of Soviet armed strength within the borders of the Soviet Union and its Eastern European Satellites. It seems to me unfortunate that the Bishops of England and Wales, however unwittingly and with whatever good intentions, should have to be numbered amongst those who serve as a front for this design. Yet, this, in fact, is their present position. I do not relish it and

I regard it as extremely unfortunate that they should have placed themselves within it, however good their intentions may have been at the time.

Reform and Defence go Together

I write what I have written in the full knowledge that I will be branded as a "warmonger" by emotively-minded individuals within the Catholic body of this country. I cannot say that the prospect disturbs me in any way at all. One gets used to this sort of thing in what is unfortunately an increasingly slogan-mongering Catholic milieu. Within it, emotive declamation is taking over from objective and rational discussion to an alarming degree. I would like, nonetheless, to take a little further this question of Catholics and the disarmament of the West in face of Communist Power. My first point would be that far too many Christian and Catholic advocates of western armament as a barrier to Soviet Grand Design appear to imply that the West, as it stands, is a viable moral alternative to Communism. I do not share this view in any way whatsoever. I reject it entirely. Western society is rotten and still rotting. Let there be no mistake about this. At the same time, let it be realised that this does not mean that, because of the rot, we should lay down our arms in the face of intended Communist aggression. What it does mean is that, whilst readying our armaments in the face of intended aggression, we should analyze the western situation, which we tolerate as a lesser evil than its Communist counterpart. Once this analysis is done, let us set about putting it right—morally, economically and socially. This is an enormous task. Because it is enormous we must not be frightened away from getting at it; and each will find, if he only looks, that there is something on his own doorstep waiting for him to do. A lead from the Bishops in this regard would be very much to the point. What we have to avoid here is the total illogic of assuming that because western civilization is rotten it is not worth defending against something more rotten still; rather like those few somewhat silly people in the late thirties who gave the impression that Hitler's rampage over Europe could be halted by slum clearance in Liverpool. I fail to

see the connection. The reason is simple. There is none. Despite Liverpool's slums in the thirties, there remained a vast difference *in kind* between Capitalist England and Nazi Germany; and the same is found today between Capitalist West (if you can still call it such) and the Communist East. The difference is this: in the Capitalist West the individual is still regarded as existing in his own right and, as such, possessed of dignity *despite* the degradation that comes to him too often from the casual ruthlessness of monopoly-capitalist structures and the increasingly insensitive impersonality of state-run welfare designs: in the Communist East, the individual is regarded as existing not in his own right because of value in himself, but on account of the State (Party) and, as such, possessed of no value in himself, but only in the measure of his contribution to the community. The difference is vast. The fact that it is being narrowed by the deprivations of western bureaucracy affords no reason for its non-defence. What the present sinister trend in this direction suggests, rather, is that, whilst we defend the less good that we have with one strong hand against a far worse evil, we should, at the same time, reform it radically with the other.

A Personal Belief

The second and final thing I would say on this subject is this. I have come to believe that, in the long run, moral strength affords the only effective check to the advance of Communist Power. This is a personal view. I believe it to be correct. Communist Oppression can in the end be broken by Christians totally dedicated in love to each other within the Faith. I believe the Soviet Union is going to be broken in this way within the life-time of the youngest reader of this Review, as the power of Pagan Rome was broken in this way by the early Christians. Oppressive hate is self-destructive. Love in Christ is deathless. Hate cannot stand in its face. This is why the blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church. Of these things I am sure. I am equally sure, however, that, at this time, this love, which can only come from and in Christ, is lacking in the neo-pagan West as never before. This is why, in the face of aggressive Communist intention, we cannot disarm. We

are without the spiritual strength—that love of each other in Christ—which would render armaments unnecessary. The sword of the spirit has slipped from our hand. This is why we have to take its counterpart made of steel, praying as we do so that there may come to our hearts, not only the love that will conquer death, but that which will turn us, for Christ's sake, to the re-Christianization of the neo-pagan West; which means placing the Cross at its heart. As we strive to do this—and let the Bishops, please, play their part—we will come to the realization that we have something of great and increasing value to defend. Only when the Cross is there where it should be most firmly—in our own hearts and, therefore, in the heart of the West—can we afford to sheathe the sword. Until that day, it must remain ready in our hand even if it is the less good we have to defend against the least.

CASSETTE CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

Father Hugh Thwaites, S.J.

The Penny Catechism explained and expanded in a series of 6 cassettes. Price £14 or \$30. Post free from C. V. Productions, Cambridge Rd., Wigmore, Gillingham, Kent, U.K.

Spanner in the Works:

DR. COGGAN AND ECUMENISM

MICHAEL DAVIES

PARAMOUNT among contemporary heresies is that of Ecumenism, more properly entitled indifferentism. There is only one correct attitude for a Catholic in the face of the present ecumenical movement — and that is total opposition. A distinction must be made between acceptable Catholic principles of ecumenism and the ecumenical movement as it is now being conducted. True Catholic ecumenism consists of explaining the Faith to those outside the Church in a clear but courteous manner so that misunderstandings can be removed and thereby help given to Christians separated from the Holy See to return to the unity desired by Christ. But the unity desired by Christ is the unity based on truth, and truth has been the first casualty of ecumenism. Even the far from satisfactory Decree on Ecumenism promulgated by Vatican II condemns “a false conciliatory approach which harms the purity of Catholic doctrine and obscures its assured genuine meaning”.

For some years after the Council it appeared that the ecumenical steamroller could not be halted; it has not been halted yet, but there are signs that it is running into obstacles that are impeding its progress and slowing it down. Two of these obstacles are the ordination of women within the worldwide Anglican Communion and the somewhat tactless behaviour of Dr. Coggan, leader of the Anglican Hierarchy in Britain. Dr. Coggan hit the headlines in May 1977 when he embarrassed the Pope by utilising an invitation to the Vatican to call for intercommunion. He is also an enthusiastic advocate of the ordination of women.

Dr. Coggan hit the headlines again in January this year as a result of an address given in London's Catholic Westminster Cathedral during the Christian Unity Octave. A front page report in the *London Times* of 26th January stated that :

"Dr. Coggan, speaking in Westminster Cathedral in the presence of Cardinal Hume, came to the very brink of encouraging Anglicans and Roman Catholics to disregard the Roman restrictions on intercommunion, saying that many had already done so, including himself. The trend was an activity of God, he said, and should be legitimized". An examination of the full text of Dr. Coggan's speech indicates that he did, in fact, actually go over the brink and incite Catholics to break Church law regarding intercommunion. Firstly, he repeated a stereotyped fallacy beloved of all members of the international ecumenical fraternity—that the reason for the negligible impact of the Church upon the world today is a result of disunity among Christians. He made a number of references to "the Church" as if Catholics and Anglicans are both part of the same Church. "Let us confess it", he said, "the impact that we make on a world which like the Greeks in St. John's Gospel, 'would see Jesus', is pathetically feeble, the witness we bear is muted, the vision which we share is blurred. I ask: Why is this so? Can the reason be that we are divided at the deepest point of unity, the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ? Is this God's judgement on us for failing to grasp this nettle? We recognise our unity in baptism; we persist in disunity at the Eucharist. So we go to our mission weak, where we should be strong and invigorated by joint participation in the Supper of the Lord".

The answer to Dr. Coggan's questions can be found in the state of the major Protestant denominations in Britain today and in the United States, with the exception of the rapidly expanding anti-ecumenical, fundamentalist sects. Reduced to its simplest terms the basic Gospel message, the "good-news" preached by the Apostles, is that our loving Father in heaven sent His only Son to atone for our sins and win us an eternity of happiness if we repent of our sins and conform our lives to His. Ultimately, the whole of human life is a struggle which will result in salvation or damnation; if it is to be salvation, a true conversion (*metanoia*) is necessary. At the risk of over-simplification, the "good-news" preached to the world by the major Protestant denominations for many decades now has been

that a conversion has taken place—but it is the world which has converted them. In an unholy eagerness to win the plaudits of the world, to make themselves acceptable, not to appear eccentric, they have converted the Gospel to nothing more than a pale imitation of what the world is already saying. Writing in the February 1978 issue of *Christian Order*, Fr. Paul Crane, S.J. commented:

“In this kind of shoddy secularist thinking the roots of the new bogus ecumenism, as well as the new morality within the Church are largely to be found . . . that instant secularized Utopia, which is the goal of its humanistic anti-faith. Inevitably, therefore, the secularization of the Church has politicized its activity, immersing its effort in the politically particular and the temporal, moving it steadily to the revolutionary Left in the wake of the radical masses it now refuses to lead, but affects to desire only to serve. The ensuing degradation is now clearly complete. Once the men of the Church led human society; now they attend on the crowd, picking up its butt-ends as they trail behind it and trying to make us believe that what they have in their hands are, in reality, king-size cigarettes . . . It is no longer a question of the Church teaching men the truth; but of suiting her truth supposedly to ease the lot of the human and earthly condition of that peculiar creature called modern man. The consequences are obvious and disastrous”.

The major Protestant denominations are now reaping the bitter harvest of their policy of offering butt-ends to those who already have an unending supply of king-sized cigarettes but who, if the truth were really known, would like to break the habit entirely. You want contraceptives? God bless you—you are showing true Christian responsibility! You want abortions? God bless you, but please don't overdo it. You don't want to believe in Hell—nor do we!

The greater the eagerness with which these denominations conformed to the world, the greater the indifference with which the world treated them. As no one else was interested in what they had to say they started talking to each other—and haven't stopped since. Ecumenism has become a necessity for survival for denominations with dwindling congregations; and ecumenical dialogue is an

effortless alternative to evangelisation. "The very fact that I am here speaking to you today is a proof of the Spirit of God working in our respective churches", says the Methodist minister in the Anglican pulpit, and the Anglican minister in the Methodist pulpit, year after year as their respective congregations dwindle and dwindle. In Britain and the U.S.A., the Catholic Church stood outside this movement, preached the Gospel, and grew in numbers and influence. Even those who hated it respected it—now they laugh at the Church, if they notice it at all. My comments on the Protestant denominations have not been made in a triumphalist spirit—Father Crane's remarks concern the current state of the Catholic Church. Our leaders are now competing with their Protestant contemporaries in grubbing for butt-ends to offer to an indifferent world.

It is very hard for any human being, even (perhaps especially) clerics to admit that they have made a mistake, that they have been following a disastrous policy. Dr. Coggan is distressed that the world is not interested when he offers it the butt-ends it has already discarded. The explanation, he concludes, is that people are indifferent not because the product is defective but because we have still not reached the stage of intercommunion. The fact that Catholic and Protestant teaching on the Eucharist are contradictory does not matter—what matters is that we communicate together. Unity—yes! Unity in truth—No! There is no more effective symbol of the ecumenical malaise than the fact that beliefs for which Catholics and Protestants were prepared to die in the sixteenth century are now seen as of no importance.

Dr. Coggan has a solution to the problem of Rome's refusal to permit unrestricted intercommunion. He used his position as a guest in England's principal Catholic Church to urge Catholics to ignore the teaching of the *Magisterium* :

"Throughout the world, men and women, ordained and lay, in both our communions, are refusing to continue in disunity at what Christ intended to be the sacrament of unity, Roman Catholics receiving at Anglican hands the tokens of Christ's passion, and vice versa. I have seen this happen, and taken part in it, and been deeply moved

it, in Australasia and in other places beyond these
lands. Order within the Church matters, and encourage-
ment must not be given to the breaking of rules. But I
ask: Is the Holy Spirit speaking to the leadership of our
churches through the voice of people who see with a
clarity sometimes hidden from our eyes, the scandal of
disunity?

"In the two famous passages in St. Matthew's Gospel
(6:19 and 13:18) about 'binding' and 'loosing', it is gener-
ally recognised that in Aramaic the terms to 'bind' and to
'loose' are academic language for the decision of the
wise rabbis as to what was 'forbidden' or 'permitted'.
Among us in the past more attention has been given to
'binding' than to 'loosing', to 'forbidding' than to 'permit-
ting'. I ask again: Is the Spirit saying to your Church:
'Ye that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins,
and are in love and charity with your neighbours, draw
near with faith—draw near *together* with faith—and take
this Holy Sacrament to your comfort'".

The most peculiar aspect, perhaps, of the affair is that
Dr. Coggan actually gave the text of his address to Cardinal
Hume beforehand and that the Cardinal "had expressed
himself happy that I should say it, even though he is unable
to agree with me because of theological differences".

The various reports on Dr. Coggan's advocacy of instant
intercommunion, with or without the blessing of Rome, all
stated that Cardinal Hume would make his reply when
addressing the General Synod of the Church of England at
Church House, Westminster on February 1st, 1978. His
reply was a rejection of Dr. Coggan's proposals in very
strong terms, and it was set within a good deal of fulsome
praise for ecumenism. The Cardinal first warned that "it
could be a matter for deep concern were the Anglican
Communion to proceed further with the ordination of
women without taking very seriously the position of the
Roman Catholic Church, our brothers of the Orthodox
Churches and the Old Catholic Church regarding so momen-
tous a change". He then dealt with "the growing practice
of intercommunion at the Eucharist. The Roman Catholic
Church holds, as you know, that for one church to share in
holy communion at the altar of another church is the

'sign and expression of that full unity which the Eucharist of its nature signifies' and should not be 'regarded as a means to be used to lead to full ecclesial communion' (Note of the Secretariat for the promotion of Christian unity, October 1973). We believe that this sharing presupposes not only the same belief in the reality of Christ's presence in the sacred species, but a common faith in general".

Far more forceful replies to Dr. Coggan have appeared in the correspondence columns of *The Times* and in the Catholic Press from priests and members of the laity who are in no way connected with the traditionalist movement. It would appear that God is using Dr. Coggan as a means of alerting Catholics to the danger of the ecumenical heresy. This was certainly the effect of his visit to Rome last April. In this instance he used his position as a guest of the Pope to make a similar appeal which even aroused England's largest circulation Catholic weekly, *The Universe*, to print a comment that was truly Catholic, an increasing rarity in recent years.

"Archbishop Coggan sees Holy Communion as a means to unity. The Catholic view was best expressed by Cardinal Hume when he spoke to Catholic journalists in London earlier this year: it should be seen not as a means, but as a sign of unity.

"There is also the question of Anglican Orders which were firmly and positively declared to be invalid by Pope Leo XIII in 1896 in his Bull *Apostolicae Curae*.

"The age of growing together may not be the most appropriate moment to restate what was stated by the Pope 81 years ago, but if truth is to mean anything in ecumenical dialogue it must be faced.

"If Catholics and Anglicans were to ignore their differences it would make complete nonsense of all the hard-worked ground on the road to unity over many years dialogue.

"There may be the hope in the minds of some Christians that a change of Pope will bring a change of doctrine, but if the Church is really guided by the Holy Spirit and upholds the truths of the gospels then such hope is in vain.

"In all 'ecumenical discussions there must be hope and charity, but there must also be faith, and the Catholic faith is too valuable an heirloom to be sold for a mess of pottage". (6th May 1977)

It would appear that Dr. Coggan's remarks also caused considerable consternation in the Vatican, as Cardinal Villibrands made hasty deletions from the joint service held in the Sistine Chapel only a few hours before it was due to take place. A conference he gave in the liberal atmosphere of the English College in Rome left a very unfavourable impression on some of those present. An eye-witness informed me that where Dr. Coggan actually answered any questions, as opposed to skirting round them in a very professional manner, his answers revealed the doctrinal weakness of the Church of England. He thought "women priests" a *fait accompli* and welcomed the practice and claimed that to forbid intercommunication was not only sinful but silly".

As a final thought on the subject of intercommunion, a passage from an article by an Anglican minister, the Revend Gordon Wilson, in the Anglican *Church Times* of January 13th, 1978, is of no little significance. He complains of the fact that intercommunion is forbidden in Britain :

"Yet Roman Catholics in other countries, notably in the diocese of Malines in Belgium, officially welcome Anglicans to Holy Communion without conditions. Having shared the simple but deep truth of a Christian Eucharist and the fellowship so openly offered, when the words of the priest : 'May we become that of which we now partake, the body of Christ', had a wonderful significance, one finds it very difficult to return to what appears by comparison redundant arguments about formal unity".

The prelate responsible for this unconditional invitation is Cardinal Suenens. Having seen a letter from another Protestant cleric testifying that Cardinal Suenens personally gives Communion to Protestants during services involving pentecostal gibberish and dancing in the aisles, it seems to be pertinent to ask whether this Cardinal is really a proper person to take part in the conclave that will elect the next Pope.

We publish here, with kind permission of the Author, the first part of a paper on the "Ministerial Priesthood and the Catholic Church", given by the distinguished Dutch Professor J. V. van der Ploeg, O.P. of the University of Nijmegen. The occasion was an international reunion of priests in the Abbey of St. Benedict at Vaals in June, 1975. The concluding half of Father van der Ploeg's important paper will be published next month. The whole has been translated by Father William Lawson, S.J., to whom great thanks are due.

Please note that this article and one that follows next month are now available in pamphlet form at 35p (post free) from the Augustine Publishing Co., Chawleigh, Chulmleigh, Devon EX18 7HL, U.K. The title is "Sacrifice and Priesthood".

Ministerial Priesthood in the Catholic Church

1: BEFORE TRENT

REV. J. V. van der PLOEG, O.P.

The Old Testament

I HAVE been asked to speak to you today on the doctrine of the ministerial priesthood in the Catholic Church, and it is taught us by that same Catholic Church. The doctrine of the priesthood is very wide, for the priest's functions are many. He is ordained to offer sacrifice, administer the Sacraments, be a shepherd of souls, preach the word of God. There is no question of dealing with all that now even in summary. We wish to consider what is most essential in the priest, how and why he is called "priest" the translation of the Latin word "sacerdos".

It is clear that the very idea of priesthood comes to us, from the historical and even the doctrinal point of view, from the Old Testament, where the priest is called *kôhên*. There was a hierarchy among the priests. At the moment when the new economy of salvation, brought by Jesus Christ, took the place of that of the Old Testament, there were in Israel a high priest, priests and levites. We now know from scientific study of the Old Testament that the organization of the priesthood, as it was on the threshold of the Christian era and for several centuries before, was the fruit of a development. The history of that development, difficult to fix especially for the stages it has gone through, is not at the moment our concern. We are speaking of the Israelite priesthood only in relation with the Christian priesthood; and what matters, therefore, is the priesthood of the Old Testament as the nascent Church found it and for which she substituted her own.

In spite of the historical fact that the Old Testament priesthood had a history which is at the same time a chronicle of development, there are very old texts which already show the amplitude of the priest's function. In Deut. 33,10, we read in the blessing of Moses on Levi, in the passage dealing with the levites: "They teach thy judgments to Jacob and thy law to Israel; they make incense rise to thy nostrils and put the holocaust on thy altar". According to this text, the levites have a double function: they teach and they sacrifice. In the course of time the second becomes the principal function, if it was not that already. In Our Lord's time, the doctors of the law were not necessarily priests or levites; it even seems that most of them were not. In Judaism at present, which is deprived of sacrifice, the rabbi has for a long time been taking the place of the priest-teacher, while the function of the *kôhên* (the old priest) is limited to pronouncing the sacred words of blessing on the community at the end of meetings in the synagogue.

According to the current idea, the priest is defined by the sacrifice: he is the man, taken from among the rest, appointed to offer a sacrifice to the divinity in the name of a community. That definition contains several elements of which the chief are the act of sacrifice, and mediation. It

is, however, not necessary that there be mediation : one can offer sacrifice just for oneself. Moreover, it is not necessary to be a priest in order to sacrifice. Abraham sacrificed in many places; he is called "prophet" but never "priest". But to be a priest without there being sacrifice is not possible. Here care is needed. In the study of comparative religion there are many problems of priesthood and sacrifice. But it is not under that aspect that we ask what is the meaning of the Christian priesthood and sacrifice. We deal with this problem or, rather, this fact of faith, starting from the faith itself and therefore also from its sources, Scripture and Tradition, presented to us by the Magisterium of the Church and interpreted by it.

New Testament : Epistle to the Hebrews

In the New Testament, only the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks explicitly of the priesthood of the New Law. That Epistle has been attributed by tradition to Saint Paul; but about that there was great hesitation (to say nothing else) in the West from the second century to the fourth. Doubts were cast not only on the apostolic authenticity of the Epistle but also on its canonicity, the two things being thought to be connected. When she added it in the last place to the *corpus* of the Pauline Epistles, the Church expressed not only her faith in its canonicity but also her acceptance of its doctrinal value by which (apart from other arguments) it deserves to be given a place with the other Epistles of the great apostle. Its doctrine is part of the very foundation of Catholic and Apostolic doctrine.

Now it is precisely this Epistle which presents us with the doctrine of the priesthood of the New Law. That doctrine we know. According to the inspired author, there took place, in the economy of salvation, a transference of the priesthood of the tribe of Levi to Jesus Christ, the only High Priest of the New Law, who offered himself to the Father once and for all in the sacrifice of the Cross, sacrifice in which he is at one and the same time Priest and Victim. There, in a few words, is the doctrine of the Christian priesthood as it is put before us by the New Testament.

By that doctrine the words "priest" and "sacrifice" take on eminently Christian meanings, and we must start from

n in speaking of the priesthood of Christian priests and the sacrifice of the Mass. That is very important, and poses the road against those who want to approach the doctrine of the Christian ministerial priesthood and of the sacrifice of the Mass starting from ideas of the priest and his sacrifice which they find elsewhere. All the same, it is not entirely false, for, to speak of priests and sacrifice, one must have a general notion of them. But it is the less true that it is from the affirmations of the honor of the Epistle to the Hebrews about the priesthood of Christ, outside which there is no priesthood, and about the uniqueness of his sacrifice, that we must begin our effort to understand the ministerial priesthood and the sacrifice of the Mass, relating them to Jesus Christ.

Let us return to the Epistle to the Hebrews. We find these words, which are almost a definition: "Every priest is taken from among men and is ordained for him that he may offer up gifts (dôra) and sacrifices (sías) for sins" (5,1). Or again: "Every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices" (8,3). That is clear, it is that which constitutes the very essence of priesthood as the Church understands it.

As for sacrifice, the Epistle teaches very clearly that Jesus himself, high priest for ever "according to the order of Melchisedech" (5,6), is at the same time priest and victim: his sacrifice is the voluntary act by which he offered himself to the Father by letting himself be killed by men, for the salvation of the world. That sacrifice was offered once, to take away the sins "of many", and it does not therefore need to be repeated, like the sacrifices of the Law. Jesus entered once into the sanctuary (heaven) and obtained eternal redemption by his own blood (9,2). That is the great doctrine of the Epistle.

Priesthood of the People of God

When the New Testament speaks in other texts of the Christian "priesthood" it is in a very different sense. It is a question of what is now called "the priesthood common to the people of God". One such text is found in the First Epistle of Saint Peter, where the Apostle tells his readers that they are "a spiritual house, a

holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices (pneumatikàs thusías), acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (2,5). little further on he calls them "a chosen generation, kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people, that you may declare the virtues of him who has called you out of darkness into his marvellous light" (2,9). In the Apocalypse of Saint John, the author tells us that Jesus Christ "has loved us and washed us from our sins in his blood and has made us a kingdom and priests for God the Father" (1, 5-6). He repeats in substance the same words in the text of a canticle sung in heaven (5, 9-10), adding that they "will reign on the earth" (5,10). Towards the end of the work the author returns to the theme, emphasizing that those who will take part in the "first resurrection" "will be priests of God and of Christ with whom they will reign for a thousand years" (20,6).

All these texts speak of the privileged position of those who are saved by the blood of Christ, and the words "priest", "reign" and "kingdom" are not to be taken in their ordinary and literal sense. They recall the Old Testament from which they have been taken, notably Ex. 19,6 and Is. 61,6. These two texts speak of the great privilege of Israel, the one people chosen out of all the others, the one people called to draw near to its God, the one God, to serve him in a very special way. Just as the priests, chosen from among the Israelites, draw near to God to serve his altar, so the whole of Israel, chosen from among the peoples of the earth, serve the God of Israel by doing his will. This position is transferred, in the New Testament, to the new people of God : the Church and the faithful. These latter are the new elect. They are therefore called "priests". They are brought together in a "kingdom" where they "reign", that is to say, they are invested with an almost princely dignity, which ranks them above all others. According to Saint Peter they should offer "spiritual sacrifices", that is, praise God and glorify him with good works.

The New Testament, then, speaks explicitly of the priesthood and the sacrifice of Jesus Christ and also of the priesthood and the sacrifices of the faithful. Amongst those who are called "priests" (*hiereîs*, plural or *hiereûs*) in a technical sense the sacred ministers of the New Testament.

re not included. The Council of Trent teaches us that at the Last Supper Jesus ordained his apostles priests and gave them power to offer the eucharistic sacrifice, but neither the word "priest" nor the term "sacrifice" is to be found in the Gospel narratives. The full meaning of the texts in question is not certain except within the tradition of the Church. We shall come back to it.

The Acts and the Epistles several times mention the *episkopoi* and the *presbíteroi* (from which our word "priest" is derived), who are entrusted with important functions in the community of the Church; but they are not given the title of "priest". That title is reserved, in the literal sense, to Christ; but in the metaphorical and spiritual sense it is reserved to the faithful.

What Protestantism Denied

We know that Protestantism denied, and still denies, the institution of a ministerial priesthood by Jesus Christ. It could hardly do otherwise: having rejected the authority of the Church, above all her magisterium and consequently her tradition, Protestantism withdrew behind the rampart of the Bible; logically it rejects anything which is not there clearly expressed, and therefore the ministerial priesthood as the Church understands it.

We Catholics, however, accept Holy Scripture as an integral part of the living tradition of the Church; it is by her that we know it, it is by her that it is interpreted, it is she who teaches what the letter of the Bible does not say or does not say clearly enough (Con. Vat. II, De Revelatione, 8). For Saint Thomas Aquinas, the apostles have transmitted to us many things concerning the sacraments which have not been recorded in Holy Scripture (S. Th. I, 72, 4 ad 1). It is above all in the doctrine of the sacraments that he appeals to apostolic tradition, which he rarely does elsewhere.

The Early Church and the Firm "Priest"

The nascent Church did not wish to give her sacred ministers the name "priests", so as to avoid all misunderstanding. The old law of sacrifices having been abolished, a new economy of salvation had begun. It was not im-

mediately desirable that the ministers of the new law should be called "priests", still less "levites", for those names were reserved for the priesthood of the Old Testament. Outside Israel the word "priest" even had a pagan flavour. But the Church soon perceived the deep parallelism existing between the ministers of the two economies of salvation. In the second century we already come across the word *sacerdos* for the Christian priest even *summus sacerdos* for the bishop, in the writings of Tertullian (160-after 220), who speaks of *sacerdotalia munera*, *sacerdotale officium*, being exercised in the Christian Church. Saint Cyprian (200/10-258; bishop in 248/9) knows the tripartite division of the ministers of the Church into bishops, *presbuteroi*, deacons, and to specify the first two categories he also uses the word *sacerdos*. To explain that it seems unnecessary to have recourse to the parallelism Old Testament—New Testament; in Latin, *presbyter* was still a foreign word, and *sacerdos* was not. But if, early on, the *presbúteroi* began to be called *sacerdotes*, that, even so, proves that the term was well suited to their function.

In the Churches of the East the words *hiereús*, *hierosún* (priest, priesthood), etc., appear very early to designate the ministers of the New Testament, bishops and priests. In the Apostolic Constitutions, an apocryphal work of Syrian origin (c. 380), we read that, as Moses had instituted a high priest, priests and levites, the Lord instituted in his Church apostles—James, Clement and others—who all instituted "presbyters", deacons, subdeacons and lectors. The analogy with the priesthood of the Old Testament is clearly expressed (VIII, 46, 13). The author continues with an even clearer expression: "He who by his nature is the first pontiff (*archiereús*), Christ, the only Son, did not snatch the honour for himself but was instituted by the Father; becoming man for our sake and offering to God his Father the spiritual sacrifice (*thusían*) before the passion, he commanded only us to do that, though there are other men with us who have received the faith; but it goes without saying that it is not because a man has received the faith that he has already been instituted priest (*hiereús*) or has received the dignity of pontiff (*archieratikês axías*). After his assumption, we ourselves, offering according to his command :

re and unbloody sacrifice, chose bishops and presbyters and seven deacons" (VIII, 46, 14-15). A little further on the author tells his readers that Stephen, the first deacon, was never seen to do what did not belong to his ministry as deacon, "offering the sacrifice or laying hands on any one" (VIII, 46, 16).

There already is the whole doctrine of the priesthood of the ministers of the Christian cult, just as it will later be proposed, repeated rather, by the Council of Trent. The ministerial priesthood is there connected with that of Christ, and there is the unbloody sacrifice which only priests can offer. Although the Apostolic Constitutions were written in the 4th century, probably in Syria, the author presents their doctrine as already old, as coming from the apostles. He could not have done that had it been a complete innovation. It is true that the synod "in Trullo" (the Quinisextum, 680, not received by Rome) rejected the Apostolic Constitutions as "falsified by the heretics" (the author was Arian), but still it did make chapter 47 of the book VIII its own, the so-called "Apostolic Canons" of which the 2nd speaks of the sacrifice (*thusia*) which the bishop or the presbyters offer "on the altar of God".

Two Fathers on the Priesthood

Two eastern Fathers well known for their writings on the priesthood are Saint Gregory Nazianzen and Saint John Chrysostom. The first (320/30-390) was ordained priest by his father, bishop of Nazianzus in Cappadocia (Asia Minor), against his will. Yielding at first to the entreaties of the community, he soon withdrew from his new ministry in flight. To justify that, he wrote his "Apologia for my flight to Uontus", in which he set out the duties of the priest, especially his pastoral duties. In this exposition, the best of its kind in the East, bishop and priest are often given the name *hiereús*.

Much better known is the celebrated work of Saint John Chrysostom (344/54-407), *Peri Hierosúnes*, "On the Priesthood", in six books, written about 396. The work is pastoral and has had an enormous success down to the present day. For Saint John, the *hiereús*, the priest *tout court*, is the bishop. In book III, chapter 4, there is a sublime passage

which treats of his sacerdotal ministry. "Although the priesthood", he says, "is exercised on earth, its place is with the heavenly institutions. It is the Holy Spirit who established it and who wished that men of flesh should exercise the ministry of angels. The priest therefore should be as pure as if he dwelt in heaven with the angelic powers. In the Old Testament, the adornments of the high priest struck fear into the Israelites; but we must say with the Apostle: What, in that, was glorious is glorious no longer, because of the glory which excels (2 Cor. 3, 10); and the author continues: "When you see the Lord lying immolated (*tethuménon*), and the priest standing before the sacrifice (*tôi thúmati*) and praying, and all become red with this precious blood, do you think you are still on earth among men? Do you not, rather, feel lifted up to heaven? . . . C. admirable vision! O love of God for man! He who is enthroned in the heights with the Father is at this moment touched by the hands of all!" "At the sacrifice of Elias on Mount Carmel"—it is still Saint John Chrysostom—"fire fell upon the holy sacrifice. With us, the priest brings down not fire but the Holy Spirit; grace comes down upon the sacrifice and sets on fire the souls of all. It is a terrible mystery; no human soul could endure that flame of the sacrifice if God did not help with his powerful grace".

A third author, this time from the West, who has treated at length of the ministry of the pastors of the Church is Saint Gregory the Great (540-604; Pope 590-604), in his *Regula Pastoralis* written in 590 when he was elected Peter's successor. It is addressed to the bishop of Ravenna. Like the two preceding works, this also is pastoral in character: the holy Pope is setting out his own programme as Pastor of the Church.

The Need for Circumspection

The meaning of the texts quoted is clear; but others are sometimes less so. When the Fathers and the old ecclesiastical writers speak of the Christian priesthood and sacrifice, one must always be careful to ask in what sense they use those words—in the literal, or in a metaphorical and "spiritual" sense. Great circumspection is required when it is a question of finding Catholic doctrine *with certainty*. That is

Some hesitate to quote in this context the famous text of the Didache, chapter 14 (which seems clear enough, but which is short), where the celebration of the Eucharist is called a sacrifice (*thusía*) by which the famous prophecy of Malachi (1, 11) is fulfilled. Reluctance to interpret such a text has its roots in the Old Testament. After the exile there is an increasing marked tendency in the people of Israel to give to prayer, above all the prayer of praise, a value equal to or even greater than ritual sacrifices. The great majority of the Jews, many of whom lived in exile, in the Diaspora, could assist at the temple sacrifices only rarely in their lives, or perhaps never. But the more pious had the custom of praying several times a day, turned towards the temple; and for them that sufficed: for them prayer took the place of sacrifice.

Saint Paul speaks of "the sacrifice (*thusía*) and the liturgy of our faith" (Phil. 2, 17): that is faith itself, living in works. The material gifts of the Church of Philippi which the ephorodites had just brought to the apostle in prison are called "and odour of sweetness (a sacrificial term, cf. Ex. 28, LXX), a sacrifice (*thusían*) which God receives and finds acceptable" (Phil. 4, 18). The apostle writes to the Romans: "I beseech you therefore, brethern . . . to offer up persons a living sacrifice (*thusían zôzan*), holy, pleasing to God; that is your spiritual worship (*ten logiken treian humon*)" (Rom. 12, 1). To the Hebrews: "By him (Christ) we offer to God a sacrifice of praise (*thusían louéseos*), that is to say, the fruit of lips confessing his name. As to deeds of kindness and the sharing of goods . . . it is in such sacrifices (*thusías*) that God takes pleasure" (Heb. 13, 15-16). The First Epistle of Saint Peter exhorts the Christians, called "a chosen generation, a holy nation, a purchased people" (1 Peter 2, 9) "to offer spiritual sacrifices (*pneumatikàs thusías*) acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 2, 5); according to the author the whole of the Christian life should be a worship pleasing to God.

The Holy Spirit Guides the Church

In the light of these texts from Holy Scriptures there is clearly a difficulty in deciding the exact meaning of chapter 14 of the Didache and of certain other words of writers of

Christian antiquity. The unexpected novelty of the new economy of salvation was not expressed at once in perfectly clear and unambiguous language—which should surprise no one. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit the Church became more and more aware of the whole content of the revealed truth entrusted to her by her Lord and God. As regards the Christian priesthood, this awareness was achieved very quickly, in a concordant and harmonious way. The texts quoted from the Apostolic Constitution and from Saint John Chrysostom are proof of that. Is more required? The sacrificial character of the eucharistic celebration is nowhere more vigorously affirmed and emphasized than in the old liturgy of the Nestorian Church which prefers to be called “The Eastern Church” *tout court*. The affirmation is repeated throughout the ceremony. When the anaphora begins, the priest, instead of saying “Let us give thanks to the Lord”, as in the other liturgies, sings aloud “A sacrifice is offered to Almighty God”. An anonymous commentator on this liturgy, writing in the 11th century, does not want more than one priest to celebrate (“concelebrare”) at the altar, because there the priest is taking the place of Christ who is the only High Priest of the New Testament. The eucharistic liturgy is called not only *qûbânâ*, a word which could be translated strictly by “offering”, but also *debhetâ*, a word which means a bloody sacrifice and which carries us back to the sacrifice of Our Lord on the Cross. The witness of the Eastern Church is of special importance because that Church very early declared itself independent of the others (in 424, under Persian influence) and developed after that in isolation. If the doctrine of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist is there so plainly asserted, it is because there we have an authentic Christian doctrine contained in the deposit of revelation.

(To be concluded)

NOT A SPARROW FALLS

Old Father Jo
Totters to the altar,
Half genuflects on creaking knees,
Takes his yellow taper
And lights the candles.

Then a painful ascent
Up the pulpit steps.

With head cocked on one side
To bring his good eye
Into better use
He opens the notice book.

As he descends he observes
(With that dim but artful eye)
A candle guttering
On the Gospel side.

Like a father
To a child in mortal danger
He leaps to its rescue,
Flicks off an excess of hot wax,
Does something swift and secret
To the dying wick,
And like the Risen Christ
It soars into life and light.

Sweet Lord,
When that Terrible Soul
Meets terrified soul
And demands an *exact* account
Of stewardship,
To his credit
Remember my friend Jo
And the way he had
With candles.

FRANK RICKARDS

In this short, but perceptive piece, Czeslaw Jesman fills in the background essential to any real understanding of the contemporary struggle in the Horn of Africa.

Background to the Horn

CZESLAW JESMAN

AT the time of writing (February), it is not yet clear whether the Soviet-Cuban build-up in Ethiopia has already reached a point sufficient to unleash the forces of Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam, the present ruler of that country, against Somalia. Barring some unprecedented external development the Ethiopian offensive would be directed ultimately by its Soviet commanders against the port of Berbera in the North of Somaliland, rather than against the prestige wastes of the Ogaden Desert. These were precious, indeed, to both Ethiopians and Somalis, but the Soviet Union is interested primarily in regaining Berbera. Until the Russians were thrown out of Somaliland last year, this port had been for a decade the main Soviet base in these latitudes and the pivot of Soviet strategy in the northern part of the Indian Ocean. This accounts, of course, for what might be called the internationalization of the Somali-Ethiopian struggle.

Basic Nature of the Conflict

As usual, the West has shown little initiative so far and less understanding of the issues at stake in this part of the world. Conceivably, there could be a "mirror game" in this unbelievable obtuseness. Kim Philby, unfortunately, is no solar myth. All the leading Powers of the world are involved today, whether they like it or not, in the Horn of Africa's destiny. A multiplicity of reasons account for this; but, at the same time, the basic, indigenous nature of the conflict is almost totally obscured by a smokescreen of specious and contradictory arguments and interpretations. Thus, it is generally surmised that the present struggle in the Horn is the outcome of two major factors in contem-

porary international affairs—the East-West confrontation and the accession of Africa as a whole to formal, political independence. In actual fact, however, both of these are largely accidental factors that have touched off a very ancient local conflict that has been simmering for at least five centuries.

4 Highland State

Ethiopia is a State and an exotic, though authentic part of Christendom. Its existence as such antedates by several centuries the emergence of modern Europe from the successive calamities which beset it after the disintegration of the Roman Empire. It is earlier by a millenium than the earliest of the Russian principalities. Its policies have been immutable, for the simple reason that they were imposed by the geography of the country itself. The Highlands of Ethiopia have always constituted the most favourable kind of environment for the growth of the articulate forms of a State. They were, and still are, landlocked. Any highland State in the Horn of Africa was bound, in the very nature of things, to strive continuously to gain access to the sea. Ethiopia was surrounded by desert plains, whose people had to be subdued or politically dominated before the Red Sea or the Indian Ocean could be reached by those who ruled the inland plateau of Ethiopia and its mountains.

No stable State emerged in the coastal plains lying between the Highlands of Ethiopia and the sea until the second half of the last century. Nevertheless, despite this oddity, which can be accounted for largely by a lack of water and of natural resources throughout the desert region, the inhabitants of this area have been, since time immemorial, an articulate, cohesive and idiosyncratic stock, imbued with a sense, at least, of common identity, if not of nationhood. There is a proverb in Somalia as old as the acacia desert: "My brother and myself against my clan; my clan and myself against other clans; all the clans and myself against the rest of the world".

Muslim and Christian

Very early in the history of Islamic expansion, the Somalis accepted with enthusiasm the teaching of the

Prophet. The notion of "Jihad", or Holy War, was attuned to their mentality. In parallel fashion, the crusading spirit was set within the mentality of the Christian Ethiopian highlanders. Thus the two groups, though distantly related by blood, were set on a collision course. In former days, technological inadequacies and the enormous distances dividing the highland centres of population in Ethiopia from the lowland Somali agglomerations prevented Christian and Muslim from flying at each other's throats. Even so, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, Somali levies formed the main contingent of the Muslim army of Mohammed, "the Left-Handed", an Afar Muslim chieftain. He came within an ace of the final destruction of Christian Ethiopia and put paid to the glories of its magnificent mediaeval civilization. Its disappearance was never made good; as a result, there was created a deep psychological trauma in the minds of the Christian Highlanders. Ever since that time there has remained embedded in the Ethiopian national consciousness an immensely strong anti-Muslim bias. Until quite recently, the "Jiberti"—or Muslim Ethiopians—of whom there are a substantial number in the North of the country, in Tigré and in the South-East around Harar, were always looked on askance by their Christian rulers as a potential Fifth Column. The late Emperor Haile Selassie I tried with some success to remedy this state of affairs, which was particularly harmful in a multinational Empire. Like all his efforts, however, his promotion of inter-faith understanding was doomed to failure. Under the impact of Marxist propaganda and other ill-digested nationalist ideas of various hues, the survival of an indigenous Christian and traditionalist monarchy became unacceptable to the nascent progressive, socialist and materialistic élite of contemporary Africa, aided, abetted and supported by a range of only peripherally dissimilar agencies. In Ethiopia, for example, the radical revolution, which overthrew the Emperor, was plotted and preached by the trendily left-wing, western intelligentsia in Adis-Abeba, which included the French teaching staff of the Lycée—maintained in the capital by the aggressively agnostic *Mission Laïque* of Paris — as well as hordes of rationalist American academics and British favourites of the Sovereign.

The Soviet Angle

For the two decades that preceded the downfall of the monarchy in 1974, Soviet operatives stayed clear of Ethiopia, for the simple reason that the necessary spade-work was being done for them very well by the disintegrating forces already indicated above. Soviet-trained Marxists only emerged when the revolution was well and truly entrenched. Only then did they declare that the liquidation of the ancient Christian-Muslim rift was to be one of the accomplishments of the new, revolutionary era; along with the extermination of the erstwhile ruling class and the dissolution of the Empire, which was to be replaced by a socialist Ethiopia. Of course, the Marxists were unable to erase by decree the many-faceted texture of contemporary Ethiopia or its imperial heritage, which was hallowed by the country's autochthonous Christian Church. In modern times, this heritage was proclaimed once again by the Emperor Menelik in the eighties of the last century. His motive was very largely to offset the colonial expansion of the Western Powers in this part of Africa. And even before Menelik assumed the imperial crown, he began—King of Shoa, the crucible of the Amhara—his life-long task as “gatherer of the sacred patrimony” with the conquest of Harar, which was then a Muslim sultanate. The issue in this particular case was decided by the battle of Chelenko in 1885. On that occasion, the Muslim Sultan's army consisted largely of Somali cavalry. Ever since this date, there have been several armed confrontations between the Somalis and the Ethiopians. The most serious was the guerilla war waged on all colonial powers—made to include Ethiopia—by a religious leader Mohammed ben Abd Allah Hassan Al Mahdi, injudiciously called by his British opponents “the Mad Mullah”. The fighting took place in the interior of Northern Somalia from 1899 until 1920, when it came to an end as the result of an influenza epidemic rather than a feat of arms.

Italian Conquest and After

Between 1936 and 1941 the Italian conquest and occupation of Ethiopia, though short-lived and incomplete, stoked the fires of future conflict between Ethiopia and Somalia.

Mussolini desired ardently to set up an Italian-run Ethiopian Empire of his own. It was called *Africa Orientale Italia*, and it embraced most of the Horn of Africa. Djibuti, a French colonial territory at the time, and the Somaliland Protectorate were to be incorporated into it at an opportune moment. The destruction of the old lore of the Ethiopian Empire—or Amhara Imperialism, according to the official Italian terminology of the period—became the principal task of the Italian Fascist Administration. In accordance with this policy, Amhara was split from the Kingdom of Shoa and became one of the six major territorial divisions of *Africa Orientale Italiana*. Somalia, an old Italian colony, was another of them: its frontiers were pushed forward at the expense of the lands conquered by Menelik II half a century before. After World War II, the dragon's teeth of Mussolini's Ethiopian policy sprouted alarmingly: Ethiopia and Somalia—the two neighbours—were unable even to set down terms of reference for frontier discussions at some later date. In the early fifties, the fumbling and condescending good offices of the British, who still had a considerable say in this part of Africa, compounded the conflict instead of helping to find a solution. For the next thirty years, a tenuous peace was maintained between Ethiopia and Somalia, but only just. In 1964, it was interrupted by a violent flare-up in the Ogaden. Once again, a settlement of the major issue was postponed but not effected. And by this time the “winds of change” were already howling across the African Continent, whilst in Moscow the African Institute was taking stock of the initial Soviet set-back in Africa, which was made manifest in a particularly humiliating way in what was then the ex-Belgian Congo. Henceforward, the major clash in the Horn was only a question of timing where the Soviet was concerned; of carefully integrating the strand of Soviet advantage into the prevailing antagonisms outlined above. These, it is unnecessary to add, had nothing to do of themselves with the Marxist class struggle or with Soviet Imperialism.

In this connection and by way of foot-note, it is interesting to notice how closely the Soviet Union's socialist solution for the Horn of Africa resembles Mussolini's fascist design for a slave empire in that part of the world.

In his consideration of the contemporary Church's fourth wound, Bishop Graber points to the need Catholics are under of studying Pope Paul's encyclical, *Ecclesiam Suam*, along with *Mysterium Fidei* his Credo of the People of God and the General Catechetical Directory. These should serve as a basis for renewed faith.

Five Wounds of Holy Church

4: THE DWINDLING OF RELIGIOUS AWARENESS

DR. RUDOLF GRABER : BISHOP OF REGENSBURG

ON 17th July, 1974 our Holy Father addressed a General Audience. His subject was "The Supernatural no longer counts". Far too little attention has been paid to the fact that in this address the Pope stresses the differentiation between the horizontal and the vertical. He alludes to "a most serious temptation of our times to neglect the vertical level, forget it and finally deny its existence altogether". It is, however, to this vertical level that the Faith belongs, which is today dwindling to an alarming degree.

There can surely be no doubt about this. There is practically no religious truth which is not either denied or, as it is put so nicely, given a new or different interpretation today. The process starts with belief in the Blessed Trinity, with the existence of angels and devils, with original sin. Revelation itself is reinterpreted, the divinity of Christ, our salvation, the immortality of the soul, everything is subjected to criticism. Quite rightly there is talk today of a return of Modernism, which Pope St. Pius X condemned, at the beginning of this century,¹ as the "synthesis of all heresies",

In his inaugural encyclical, *Ecclesiam suam*, which he gave us on 6th August 1964, i.e. while the Council was still in progress, our Holy Father spoke of the fact that we "are seeing today a revival of the errors of Modernism". It is thus by no means the case that the dwindling of faith has only just been noticed now, ten years after the Council, and that we have had to wait until today for certain cries of alarm to be uttered. During the Council itself the Pope as the supreme guardian of the Faith assessed the situation of the Church as being in a "state of lively ferment and unrest". At that time, thirteen years ago, he already spoke of "the danger of uncertainty, of a numbing, an aberration as if the Church were forced to deny its identity and assume quite new and unsuspected forms of life"; and, in this context, he again referred to the "Modernism which continues to live on in various guises". It was the Pope himself who, again at this time, was already warning against an unhealthy Ecumenism in these words: "Our concern to draw closer to our brothers must not be allowed to lead to a diminishing or impairing of the truth". He rejects Irenism and Syncretism and declares solemnly that it does not "lie in his power to overstep the limits set us by the integrity of the Faith and the demands of charity". It is untrue to accuse him of destroying the Church when he himself speaks on the contrary of the "*autodemolizione*", the "self-destruction" of the Church, when he states that there is only "one true religion, the Christian" and that it falls to the share of the Catholic Church "to lead together again the flock of Christ".

With equal frankness the Pope on the same occasion criticized the false interpretation of his predecessor's "aggiornamento", which took the form of accommodation to the world. In his own words, "The Church will find its new youth not so much by changing its external statutes but rather through an inner attitude of obedience towards Christ, by observing those laws which the Church gives itself in order to walk in the steps of Christ. It is here that the secret of the renewal lies, here its '*metanoia*', here is practising of perfection". This brings us to the crucial question: why have we not listened to the voice from Rome and adhered to its words? In this inaugural encyclical of

Our Holy Father everything we should and should not do stated clearly enough and if today the Council is going to be held responsible for many a false development, we could nevertheless bear in mind that the Pope is the preme ultimate interpreter of the Council too.

Let us in this connexion also touch briefly on another problem which is a source of confusion to many people today. In Pope Paul VI's first encyclical the following words are to be found: "Like our predecessors and together with all who have preserved an appreciation of religious values we feel obliged to condemn the atheistic systems persecuting the Church . . . among them, in particular, atheistic Communism". This condemnation nevertheless does not prevent the Pope from engaging in a dialogue with these modern atheists as well since they are occasionally atheists out of pure idealism, out of indignation at mediocrity and egoism". Where this is not the case, "the dialogue ends and the Silent Church . . . from then on speaks only through its sufferings".

We referred above to the dwindling of faith in the post-conciliar period. Who remembers that while the Council was still in progress, the Holy Father presented an encyclical on the mystery of the Eucharist, *Mysterium fidei*? Hence, as is stated there, "the mystery of the Eucharist (is) the source of life" of the Church, distortions and erroneous opinions with respect to this Sacrament are particularly grave. In this case, too, it would be an injustice to reproach the Church or the Pope with not having commented on the matter in time. The Pope states explicitly that serious reasons of pastoral solicitude and concern" and his apostolic duty of conscience urge him to speak and not to remain silent. The Pope unambiguously rejects a merely symbolic interpretation of this most holy Sacrament and the introduction of new concepts such as "transignification" or "transfinalization", stating explicitly that "it cannot be tolerated that anyone can tamper at will with the formulae used by the Council of Trent to express how the mystery of the Eucharist is to be believed". Are these not plain and unambiguous words? The Pope's advocacy of private Masses is expressed with equal clarity: he recommends "in a fatherly and earnest manner" that priests should "cele-

brate Mass daily, with dignity and devotion, so that they themselves and the Christian faithful as a whole may benefit from the fruits which flow over-abundantly from the Sacrifice of the Cross". We ought to allow the Pope to speak at length here on the cult of worship, which has receded into the background today as well, and also on the fact that the Blessed Sacrament is *the* way to Christian unity. Would it have come to this dwindling of faith if we had modelled and fashioned our lives on the spirit of this encyclical, on the *Mysterium Fidei*, the mystery of faith?

This uncertainty in matters of Faith leads to bitter complaints precisely on the part of the most faithful believers: we are completely at a loss, we no longer know what to believe, the Faith of our childhood has been taken from us, we can no longer in good conscience send our children to religious-instruction classes and buy them textbooks for religion which deal with every conceivable subject except religion and Faith. These are serious reproaches and, unfortunately, not without foundation. What is to be done about it? On 30th June 1968 the Holy Father gave us a document which provides an answer to these questions and reproaches, his *Credo of the People of God*. The few pages of this brief catechism inform us of everything to which we must adhere in faith. Here, even the simplest believer can check with ease whether what he hears and reads on questions of faith is in accordance with the teaching of the Church. This is also valid in the case of a word which today goes so far as to raise the confusion to the status of a principle and extols the present multiplicity of views and opinions as representative of the greatest progress of our times and the culmination of all our questioning and research: this word is "pluralism". In order to avoid any misunderstanding it must be stated at once that there is also a genuine and proper pluralism, one on which our Holy Father enlarged in his General Audience August 28th, 1974. This true pluralism "illuminates the fruitfulness of our Catholic doctrine", "the abundant wealth of forms of expression"; it is comparable with "an orchestra in which the great variety of instruments and the diversity of their individual voices work together to bring forth a single wonderful harmony". But what is making the round

der this name today is exactly the opposite: it is simply stringing together of all the opinions, hypotheses and conjectures that pass themselves off as theology, right down to "Death of God" theology. This is not only a theological violation of the first degree but also a philosophical violation of the law of contradiction. It shatters faith and destroys it at its root. And it is at this point that we find ourselves today. The horizontal has triumphed. To round all this off, there is blasphemy, too. Mother Basilea Schlink of the Protestant Sisters of Mary in Darmstadt has given details of this in her various writings, especially in the booklet, *Jesus Derided* (new), and Professor Beyerhaus reports of an African stage-play entitled "Muntu", which was performed at the beginning of the Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Nairobi in 1975: "The most sounding laughter was to be heard when the baptism of the first African woman was portrayed and when the Holy Trinity was named". The Author adds the following comment: "It remained for the representatives of the Patriarchate of Moscow alone to recognize the blasphemous character of the play . . . They were more scandalized by the play than other delegates. In the view of the Moscow hierarchy the play is deeply atheistic".²

What shall we do? (cf. Acts 2,37). First of all we should take up our Holy Father's invitation and "inspire a lively, profound and conscious act of faith in Our Lord Jesus Christ". We should then set a seal on this moment in our religious life with a strong and convinced, yet humble and trembling profession of faith similar to that of the man born blind in the Gospel whose eyes Jesus had opened with equally great grace and strength: "I believe, Lord" (Jn 9, 38); or like Martha's "Yea, Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, who art come into this world" (Jn 11,27); or like the profession of faith by St. Peter which is so dear to us: "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God" (Mt 16,16).

NOTES

In his encyclical *Pascendi* of 8th September, 1907.

Peter Beyerhaus & U. Betz, *Okumene im Spiegel von Nairobi 75* (Ecumenism in the Mirror of Nairobi 75), Bad Liebenzell 1976, p. 77f.

Any Questions

Is it out of date to try to spread the Gospel by converting "the Top People"?

The conversion of anybody is up to date. That is what evangelization is about. Our Lord commissioned the Apostles and the Church to "preach the Gospel to every creature". He Himself offered the good news of salvation to everyone, those at the top and those at the bottom: scribes, Pharisees and ordinary folk; and the early Christians were a cross-section of the population—the poor, men and women of property, high-ranking officers in the Roman army, members of patrician families, and even relatives of emperors. Your question arises, perhaps, from the apparent policy of missionaries of making for kings and princes first, because, if they could be converted, their authority would be exerted to encourage, enforce even the conversion of their subjects. St. Augustine of Canterbury exemplifies that policy, as do St. Francis Xavier and other Jesuits in Europe and elsewhere.

We no longer have kings and princes of that sort; but mankind is never without leaders (human beings, in the main, are followers) and it makes sense to give special attention to those whose conversion could lead to more conversions. Missionary priorities do not change: it is people's positions and degrees of influence that have changed. A missionary effort should begin with an examination of society to see where power lies. Imagine the transformation of this country if all trade union bosses became Catholics—and all shop stewards and secretaries of local branches! They would have a fight on their hands but their acceptance and application of the Catholic principles of social justice would be an attractive advertisement for Catholicism itself. The top, these days, is above and below; and that is where the Gospel should be preached.

As Catholics, we owe obedience to the Pope. Is it always the same kind of obedience? If there are different kinds, what precisely are they?

There are two kinds of obedience owed to the Pope. The first is *extraordinary* obedience, an immediate unquestioning acceptance as true of what the Pope teaches with his *extraordinary* teaching authority (magisterium), which is guaranteed by the Holy Ghost to be free from error. The second kind of obedience is *ordinary*, corresponding to the teaching of the Pope backed by his *ordinary* magisterium, and to his government of the Church in what belongs to the administrative, legislative, liturgical or judicial order, and to politics and diplomacy. What is taught by the extraordinary magisterium is right. What issues from the ordinary magisterium or from the Pope's supreme authority to govern may be wrong: a policy may be mistaken; an excommunication may be unjust; a liturgical ordinance may prove a danger to faith. Normally we obey at once and continue to obey; but if, after a time, we have misgivings about a command, we are entitled, according to our competence, to examine the command for faults. If we find one, we have a right to ask that it be corrected.

The position is clear if doctrine is in question. When Cardinal Felici was secretary of the Second Vatican Council, he said about the Council's schemas and chapters: "those which appear to be innovations should be treated with reserve"; and the bishop of Campos in Brazil, Antonio Castro Mayer, wrote in a Pastoral Letter of 1971: "if an act of the Ordinary Magisterium of a Pope disagrees with the teaching guaranteed by the tradition of several popes over a long period of time, it should not be accepted". Because "the law of worship is the law of faith", liturgical ordinances may need to be examined in the light of the law of doctrine.

Book Review

ARMS AND THE MEN

The Communist Challenge to Africa by Ian Greig
Foreign Affairs Publishing Company 11, Petersham Road
Richmond, Surrey TW10; £3.00; pp. 306.

This book by Ian Greig gives as accurate an account as I know of what might be called the technics of Soviet strategy with regard to the African Continent. One is left however, with a false impression which is that, given the vast quantities of war material that Russia has deposited all over Africa, that continent is almost within her grasp. I do not believe this to be true for two reasons.

In the first place, there is no guarantee that the Soviet presence, which is deposited in an African country along with Soviet arms, will necessarily remain there for any length of time. The reverse in fact has happened more frequently than the Soviet Union would care to admit. Shortly before I began reading this book the last of the Soviet personnel had been packed into planes at uncomfortably short notice and kicked out of Somalia. The losses incurred by the Soviet Union as a result of the failure of its policy in that country have probably run into hundreds of millions of pounds, to say nothing of the severe blow to their Indian Ocean strategy, which the forced closure of their military and naval base at Berbera has brought them. Neither is Somalia an isolated example. A week or so before they were being bundled out of that country, the last remaining Soviet personnel received their marching orders to clear out of Khartoum. There are none left there now as I write these lines. Neither are there any left now in Egypt, a country which the Soviet Union once armed to the teeth and at enormous cost to itself. How much the Soviet Union lost in Egypt I do not know. I would suggest however, that the failure of their policy in that country was more expensive even than their most recent failure in Somalia, and that is saying something. Moreover, there have been other failures before these most recent ones.

Ghana was the first. The Soviet Union has never recovered from the mortal blow dealt to its influence in that country when Kwame Nkrumah was overthrown. Yet, the Soviet impact had been great in Ghana; built up with patience and considerable skill over the years. It was gone in a matter of days.

It is, of course, easy to be complacent. It is easy, too, to forget the Soviet successes. Concerning these, the real question, surely, is, how successful have they been? I am brought to the second of my two reasons for doubting whether the African Continent is as nearly within the Soviet grasp as Ian Greig would appear to think it to be. What I doubt is whether the ideology of Communism, even in those African countries where the Soviet Union appears to have achieved some success, has penetrated as deeply to the hearts and minds of the African people as the author of this book would appear to think. I would find it very difficult to believe that this was the case, even in Angola and Mozambique, where Samora Machel would appear at first sight to be more of an ideologically convinced Marxist than any ruler in Africa, with his talk of making a new kind of man in that country and his seeming determination to make use of the whole Marxist bag of tricks as a means to that end. Yet, even in this case, I am not at all sure. Does Machel want a new man in Mozambique because he is a Marxist or is he a Marxist because he wants a new man? The two are by no means the same. I would incline to the view that the latter is closer to his real stance. He would say, I believe, that his people have been second-class citizens whilst under Portuguese rule. Now, he wants to make them first-class citizens; and who would not? His way to that, however mistakenly, is through the Marxist ideology and apparatus, as a *means* and not as an end in itself. In other words, Machel may well be a pragmatist and, in this, typical of the people of the continent; not an ideologue, but a pragmatist. Meanwhile, what is the Soviet Union gaining from the situation in Mozambique? Certainly, not an ideological grip on its people. Not yet, so far as I know, all the naval facilities that it wants, though Nachala harbour is serving it. Advisers, yes; but not an *effective* presence; and the pros-

pect, if she attempts to penetrate deeper, of an involvement from which the Soviet Union shrinks. What then? Bases from which those who are Rhodesian African Nationalists *primarily* and essentially *pragmatic* in outlook hope to repeat in Rhodesia what was done in Mozambique, but with Mozambique's present situation in mind *not as* an ideal but as something to be *avoided*. I know what I am talking about here.

A Kaleshnikov rifle can be handled equally well and often better by a pragmatist than an ideologue. From what I know of the nationalist guerillas in Rhodesia I would place them in the former category; which makes them the truer patriots. What they want is not only independence, but a better way of life for the poor at the grassroots of their black community. That wish does not make them Communists. Its fulfilment should be the desire of every Christian, though there are good means and bad means to its achievement.

Mr. Greig has written a good book. It would have been better had he looked beneath the arms flow at the deeper realities of the African scene.

Paul Crane, S.J.

MINI-TRILOGY ON THE MASS

The Tridentine Mass...pp. 32; 30p or \$1 (post-free)

The New Masspp. 40; 30p or \$1 (post-free)

The Roman Rite

Destroyedpp. 48; 35p or \$1 (post-free)

All three by Michael Davies. Essential reading.
Argument unbreakable. Obtain from publishers:

Augustine Publishing Company,
Chawleigh,
Chulmleigh,
Devon EX18 7HL, U.K.